

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXXXVII.

DECEMBER, 1908.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESULTS OF THE ELECTION.

BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

DEMOCRATS and superior persons, who in greater or less numbers serve in political campaigns as Democratic auxiliaries, constantly assail the Republican party as guilty of the crime of desiring to live upon its past. This habit is a very old one, and this particular criticism of the Republican party is one which, ever since I can remember, I have heard made against that party with varying degrees of intensity. The Democrats, considering their own history, have good reason to make the attack, and the auxiliaries employ it for lack of something better to say. Yet it is, after all, as natural for Republicans to refer to their past, although they indulged in it very little during the campaign just closed, as it is for Democrats to object to discussing party records. I premise this by way of apology, because it seems to me impossible to say anything intelligently as to the results of the late election without a reference to some of the facts of history.

The Republican party came into power and complete control of the Government in 1861. It retained that complete control until 1875, when the House became Democratic. The House re-

VOL. CLXXXVIII.—NO. 637

51

Copyright, 1908, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

mained Democratic until the election of 1880; and, during the last two years of the administration of President Hayes, the Senate was also Democratic. With the accession of Garfield in 1881, complete Republican control was re-established, but the House of 1883 was again Democratic and remained so until 1889. The Democrats also had the Presidency from 1885 to 1889. From 1889 to 1891, the Republicans were once more in complete control. At the elections of 1890, however, they lost the House, and in 1892 the Presidency and the Senate as well. For the next two years, therefore, from 1893 to 1895, the Democrats had complete control of the Government. In 1894, they lost the House in an overwhelming defeat; and, since 1897, complete control of the Government in all its branches has been in the hands of the Republicans. In the forty-eight years which have elapsed since 1860, the Republicans have had complete control of the Government for thirty years, and in addition they have controlled one or more branches of the Government for sixteen. In other words, in forty-eight years the Democratic party has had complete control of the Government for only two. These statistics are impressive. They cannot be explained away on the ground of accident, or good fortune, or superior organization, or the possession of money. They furnish conclusive proof that the American people have an almost incurable distrust of the Democratic party and a deep-seated belief that the Republican party has leaders of greater ability, that it is able to rule and govern, and that, whatever its defects or shortcomings, it has done, on the whole, good work for the country and can be intrusted more safely than its opponents with the heavy responsibility of legislation and administration.

It is obvious, then, that one result of the election has been to demonstrate once more, and most emphatically, that a large majority of the American people have no confidence in the Democratic party and are, as before, ready to trust the Republicans after a large experience of Republican supremacy. It is also shown by the election that the American people still regard the Republican party as a better and more efficient instrument of government than their opponents. People, as a rule, do not stop to consider the statistics as to party control during the last half century, but they have a deep significance; and the fact that during that long period the Democrats have been able to get complete

control of the Government for only two years possesses an important meaning which deserves to be carefully pondered.

Passing now from what we may call the general historical aspect of the late election, let us try to discover its significance in relation to the vital questions of the present day. Primarily, the vote of November 3rd was a vote of confidence in the Republican administration of Theodore Roosevelt, and of approval of the policies associated with his name. When Mr. Roosevelt came into the Presidency, he found a situation which for some years had been a subject of grave and growing anxiety to all reflecting men. Great aggregations of capital and great corporations, the necessary and, economically, the beneficial developments of modern times, had gained a position in the business world which was almost despotic; and they were also exercising a political power which was dangerous and, in many cases, both corrupt and corrupting. The possession of this power had made many of the men who exercised it entirely lawless. They had come to feel that money and "business interests" had the right to do what they pleased, and to disregard and override laws which in any way interfered with their desires. The knowledge of these facts had become general and had produced, not among the discontented and violent elements of society merely, but among the great body of the American people, who are honest, industrious and patriotic, and who have no base envy of wealth or success, a profound feeling of unrest. This great element of the people, naturally conservative and law-abiding, the bone and sinew of our body-politic, were beginning to feel, not merely that their individual rights in business and daily life were disregarded and frequently trampled upon, but that their own Government was passing out of their rightful control into the hands of a comparatively small number of persons who possessed large amounts of money. With these apprehensions the American people were beginning to listen to the agitators and men of violence, who in many instances were actuated by envy and malice, and who always wished to destroy, and sometimes to obtain revenge for real or fancied wrongs. In other words, the American people were beginning to lose confidence in their Government, and no greater peril to the Republic can be imagined than a failure of faith in its principles and institutions. President Roosevelt met this situation, and he has restored the confidence of the American people

in their national Government. He has made them feel once more that the Government is theirs and represents them, and is not controlled by money or by great corporations. He has achieved this impressive result by enforcing the laws without regard to the wealth or the power of those who violated them, and by urging and securing additional legislation which enables the Government to regulate and supervise the railroads, and by proving that the Government exists for the benefit of all the people and is not the chattel of financial interests, no matter how great and potent those interests may be. For this work he has been savagely denounced. The attacks have come from those whom he has brought to the bar of justice and whose violations of the law he has arrested. Money is powerful and can hire many people to plead its cause and assail its enemies, in some instances, at least, with an absolutely insane fury. President Roosevelt has also had to endure the severe and even savage criticisms of many personally honest people, who thought it better that certain great financiers and managers of corporations should violate the law than that their own investments should be disturbed by bringing the violators of the law to justice. But, whatever attacks have been made upon Mr. Roosevelt, the American people understood what he was doing and gave him their confidence without limit or deduction. Assailed with greater bitterness, perhaps, than any President in our history, among the American people at large he became during his term of office the most popular and trusted President who ever occupied the White House. It is the fashion with his opponents, who are extremely vocal, even if they are not numerous, to speak of him as destructive and as a promoter of socialistic tendencies. History will say, and calm judgment will declare before history is written, that his course has been fundamentally conservative. To those who have studied the currents of popular feeling and of public opinion, and who are not blinded by personal interests or paid to advocate the business of money-making as the most sacred of causes, it is now apparent that if Mr. Roosevelt had not met the situation which confronted him with force and courage, some one who would make Mr. Bryan seem like a timid reactionary would have been elected on the third day of November, and legislation would have followed which would have been little short of a social and political revolution.

To accomplish his purpose of destroying evils which had grown up, Mr. Roosevelt had a task of the utmost difficulty. He was obliged to steer between the radicals of discontent, on the one side, and the radicals of reaction on the other, utterly opposed to each other, but who in their different ways would alike have brought on violent and destructive changes, if not actual revolution, could either extreme have had its will. Mr. Roosevelt has succeeded in following this difficult middle path and has incurred the reproaches of both sets of extremists and especially of the reactionaries, who like the rule of money and of what is euphemistically called "business interests." It was not easy to argue directly that Mr. Roosevelt was to be overthrown because he proposed to enforce the laws in the execution of his sworn duty, or to revile him because he urged additional legislation to curb existing and admitted evils. So his opponents, for the most part, resorted to the old trick of saying that his objects were good but that his methods were bad, violent and disturbing. Danton declared that revolutions were not made with rose-water and profitable wrong-doing fights and dies hard. Vested abuses cannot be extirpated by soft words or gentle deprecation, nor can the people be aroused or public opinion formed and moulded in whispers. Mr. Roosevelt struck hard and often, he aroused the people, he gathered behind him an overwhelming force of public sentiment; and, in so doing, he hurt the money-making opportunities of some people and jarred upon the feelings of others who disliked being rudely disturbed. But a beginning had to be, and tender touches would probably not have affected very much evils which had hardened during many successful years. It is proper and appropriate to use the shears and the pruning-knife in an old English park or an ancient Italian garden, but you must attack the wilderness and the jungle with an axe if you would clear away the noxious growths, let in the light of day and make the generous soil fit for cultivation. The work of the pioneer is always hard and often rough, but it is the great work, none the less, upon which all that comes after of beauty and profit must depend. In any event, Mr. Roosevelt did his work. He restored the confidence of the people in their own Government, he enforced the laws, he uncovered and punished corruption, and he has raised the moral tone of both business and politics. Then he did what no other man or body

of men could have done, took himself finally and irrevocably out of the list of Presidential candidates, although he could have easily had a third term, an act which many people think a great renunciation in accord with the best traditions and the keenest sense of honor, and which they also believe will loom large in the pages of history which future generations will read.

Thus it befell that the Republican party was called upon to pass judgment upon Mr. Roosevelt's administration, and to choose the man whom they desired to be his successor.

When the Republican National Convention met, it approved the Roosevelt policies and promised their continuance. It then nominated Mr. Taft as its candidate for President. Mr. Taft was a leading member of the Administration which had formulated and put the Roosevelt policies into operation. He had the earnest support of the President, and he has declared over and over again that he should continue the policies of the Administration of which he himself had been a member. Mr. Taft is a man whose words may be absolutely believed, and of such strong character and determination that every one knows that any promise which he makes will be fulfilled to the letter, so far as he has power to do it. Thus the issue upon the Roosevelt policies was put to the people clearly and distinctly by declaration and by candidate, and their answer has been given in electing Mr. Taft by a large majority of electoral votes and by an enormous popular plurality. The issue was plain and the verdict was even plainer.

It must be remembered, also, in giving due weight to the electoral majority and the popular plurality, that the Republican party is always confronted by the unreasoning and stolid vote of the South. The electoral vote of the Southern States gives no just idea of the opinions of the people of those States upon the issues of the day. The Southern electoral vote merely means hostility to the negro, and it has not changed since the days of reconstruction. The feeling against the negroes is kept alive now solely for party purposes, and the increase of the white Republican vote in the South in favor of Mr. Taft is one of the hopeful signs of the last election. Without being oversanguine, this increase of the Republican vote, which is wholly among the whites, suggests that the South is slowly awakening to the false and unhappy position which it occupies. The result of their present position is that the Democratic party cares nothing for their

interests, and will do nothing for them because it is sure to have their votes, no matter who is nominated and no matter what policies are declared. The Republican party cares less than nothing about them, for it knows that in any event the electoral vote of the South will be Democratic. It is a wretched position for a great group of States to occupy, and the time must come when the people of those States will cease to cast a meaningless vote upon a dead issue and will once more express their opinions upon the tariff, the currency, the standard of value, the policy to be pursued toward corporations and other living questions. Mr. Taft rendered a great service to the country when he went into the Southern States, and the increase of the Republican vote is a good omen because it shows that the white men of the South are beginning to grow restive under a condition which compels them to throw their votes away so far as any question in which they are really interested is concerned, and which makes them politically a negligible and a neglected part of the Union.

Another result of the election is to show that a majority of the American people favor the Republican attitude in regard to the banks and adhere firmly to the policy of protection. As to the latter question, indeed, the strength of the protection policy is not sufficiently exhibited in the popular vote, because it gives only partial expression to the beliefs of Southern protectionists and because many men who believe in protection in the North vote the Democratic ticket from habit, or are against the Republican party for reasons other than its position upon the tariff.

There was one other very momentous question upon which the American people expressed a very decided opinion, which was only in an indirect manner an issue between the great parties, but which was none the less passed upon by the voters. The Democratic party adopted a resolution in regard to labor which might mean anything and on its face meant nothing. Mr. Gompers, however, after a conversation with Mr. Bryan, announced that Mr. Bryan took a position satisfactory to him and that he proposed to give him the votes of organized labor, and as far as possible of unorganized labor too. Now, although we do not know what the Democratic party meant by their resolution, we know exactly what Mr. Gompers meant when he stated that Mr. Bryan's position was satisfactory to him, although Mr. Bryan maintained a stillness upon this subject which was as profound as

it was unusual. In the ocean of his talk, his practical silence in regard to his relations with Mr. Gompers was as conspicuous as a lonely rock rising up in splendid solitude from the waste of waters. But what Mr. Gompers proposed and that to which he said Mr. Bryan was committed was the bill which the former had caused to be introduced in the present Congress. This bill, briefly stated, legalizes the boycott and the black list, and deprives every man of his property in his business or in the good-will which he may have been able to establish. It created, in effect, a privileged class and gave to certain American citizens the right to engage in acts which all other citizens would be criminally prosecuted for attempting. Nothing more un-American or more hostile to the welfare of the Republic was ever proposed than this attempt to establish by law a privileged class, when one of the cornerstones of American Government is the hitherto unquestioned doctrine that there shall be no privileged classes in the United States. The means by which Mr. Gompers sought to accomplish his ends was to use non-political organizations, formed for totally different purposes, organizations which hold secret meetings, in such a way as to compel all the members, no matter what their political affiliations might be, to vote as he commanded because they belong to these non-political organizations and were members of one class in the community. To use secret organizations to control politics is bad enough, but to seek to array class against class in the United States is little short of a crime against our free representative Government. With these methods and with these objects, Mr. Gompers entered upon a violent campaign in behalf of Mr. Bryan, which, if successful, would have made him little short of a dictator, so far as one highly important field of legislation was concerned. Dictators of any kind are justly hateful to the American people, and the very idea is alien to all American traditions; but a dictator like Mr. Gompers would be deplorable. From the domination of Mr. Gompers this election has rescued us for the time at least, and time is a powerful ally in a combat against dangerous principles in politics and government. The working-men of the country, as any examination of the returns clearly shows, refused to be delivered by Mr. Gompers and insisted on voting according to their political convictions. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that they resented the attempt of Mr. Gompers to crush their political in-

dependence and convert them into the helpless tools of a leader whom they themselves had created for far other purposes and to perform a wholly different task. It is also clear that the voters generally regarded with great disfavor Mr. Gompers's plan of creating a privileged class, and, still more, his attempt to embitter feeling and array class against class with such objects in view. In this connection, it may also be observed that one of the encouraging results of the election was the failure of the Socialists to obtain anything like the vote which they boasted would be theirs. The wild denunciations of Mr. Debs, and his brutal attacks upon everybody who differed from him and especially upon those who had succeeded where he had failed, apparently found little response among the great body of American voters. It is not wise to underrate the Socialistic movement, and, as it aims at a political and social revolution which would carry us back to a lower level of civilization, it is well to do battle with it at every stage in its career; but it is encouraging to note that it does not seem to be prospering among the American people, even in a period of depression when those who seek to destroy crowd with hoarse clamor into the field of politics as the birds of prey hover over the field of battle.

In addition to the great national results, there was one State election which assumed national proportions and has a national significance. That was the contest for the Governorship of New York. The election of Governor Hughes goes far beyond the limits of a party victory in its meaning and importance. This is due, not only to his own character and achievements, but to the nature of the opposition which he encountered. Governor Hughes had shown himself a strong man as Governor, and as one devoted to promoting at all hazards what he honestly believed to be right and in the public interest. The criticisms upon him for lack of tact and for an unsympathetic attitude toward those with whom he came in contact were trivial and not to be considered in the light of his great services to good government and in view of the ability and force of character which he had displayed. Mr. Chanler ran against him, not on any merits of his own or as representing any policies, but solely in the interests of certain elements in the community which for selfish or base reasons were opposed to Governor Hughes. It so happened that those elements which were most interested in compassing Governor

Hughes's defeat were the most undesirable that exist. Mr. Chandler not only appeared as their representative and beneficiary, and in no other capacity, but he showed himself to be helpless in debate and his speeches were so feeble that even party zeal withered beneath them. It is not too much to say that the defeat of Governor Hughes, in the light of his own record and of the quality of the opposition to him, by the candidate who ran against him, and by the methods which were employed for his overthrow, would have been a national calamity. It would have declared in unmistakable terms to all men in public life, and especially to young men entering politics, that a man who fought for the right must expect nothing but defeat, and that the road to success was to be found in a servile subserviency to special interests and to some of the worst elements in the community. That the attempt to defeat Governor Hughes failed is a cause for profound satisfaction, because it is a victory for what is best in American politics and will help to encourage high ideals of public service.

Thus it has come to pass that the people have again committed the Government of the country to the Republican party for another four years. This renewal of power brings with it heavy responsibilities, for there are many very serious questions just now to be dealt with at Washington. It is not a moment for wild exultation on the part of Republicans, but for very sober reflection as to the duties which lie before them. The party is fortunate in having as President one of the best men ever chosen to that great office. No man better equipped and better trained was ever nominated by any party for the Presidency. He not only takes with him his training and experience, as well as a wide knowledge of the work of administration and of diplomacy, but he is imbued with a fine spirit of disinterestedness and has a complete sense of his great responsibilities. He is entirely fit to be President of the United States, and it is not possible to give him higher praise. Under his leadership, we may confidently hope that the Republican party will meet the responsibilities which lie before it as successfully as it has met them in the past, for responsibility is not new to the Republican party; and, although there have been moments in its career when it has hesitated, it has never in the end failed to rise to a great opportunity or shrunk from settling difficult and perplexing questions.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

GOD, MAN AND IMMORTALITY.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW.

BY PETER S. GROSSCUP, JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT
COURT OF APPEALS.

AN article in a recent number of this REVIEW, by the late D. H. Chamberlain, in reconstruction days Governor of South Carolina, entitled "Confessions of a Free Thinker," and the comments thereon by Professor Goldwin Smith, have prompted this article.

Mr. Chamberlain's article is not a compact or scientific statement of any theory or belief; it is rather a statement of the picked-up thoughts of a bystander who has allied himself to a theory or belief; and Professor Goldwin Smith's article is only a running commentary in the way of reply. The subject, from a purely popular standpoint, deserves, it seems to me, a more careful exposition; and, while I am but a layman both in science and theology, the work can be performed, perhaps, as well by a layman as by an expert.

Ex-Governor Chamberlain was one of those men who, attracted to the subject as only a side interest in a busy life, came late in life to believe that the universe is entirely physical; that man is but one of the many physical outbursts of this physical universe; that there are no such things as mind distinguished from matter, spirit distinguished from body—mind and spirit being functions only of matter, as digestion is a function of the stomach; that there is no overruling intelligence, no moral plan, no personal immortality. And could we penetrate the shell of the more or less conventional beliefs of the world, we might find many such men—mental lives that run in their later years in exactly opposite directions to the mental lives of their earlier years; mental lives that run in exactly opposite directions to the mental lives of such men as Kant, Virchow and Bois Raymond,

who, beginning in their views on this subject where Chamberlain left off, themselves left off, in their ripened maturity, in the full conviction that there is a God, a soul-life aside from physical life, and an immortality.

The best popular exposition, perhaps, of the school of thinkers into which Chamberlain drifted, will be found in the books of Ernest Haeckel, Professor in the University of Jena; and his best single book, perhaps, the one entitled "The Riddle of the Universe." I am not competent, of course, to measure argument on this subject with a man of the vast resources of Haeckel; nor would one who was competent have room enough within the space of a magazine article. But I can state, I think, accurately and fully, the thread of his reasoning, and place against it the considerations that make it, to my mind, wholly inconclusive as a demonstration of the theory that man is wholly material—that mind and spirit are nothing but functions of matter.

The most interesting and suggestive link in the chain on which this materialistic theory proceeds is the striking resemblance between the evolution of man as a species, and the evolution of each particular man and woman of the species—man, as a species, evolved from the simplest and lowest organisms of the world's animal life, and the individual man and woman evolved from the temporary foetal organism in which each begins. In man as a species, millions of years were spent in the process of evolution, the material beginning in a simple cell; while, in the individual man, the evolution takes place in the flash of a moment, comparatively, from the temporary foetal organism. In the evolution of man as a species, the lowest stages of organization are endowed with sensitiveness; in the evolution of the individual man, the same is true. In the second stage, in each, infinitely different as they are in the point of time involved, there is the same appearance of simple sense organs, followed by differentiation into specific organs; and this again by a nervous system becoming more and more complex and centralized. After that, conscious perception; and finally the higher mental and moral perceptions, as distinguished from the perceptions that the lower animals have—each individual man and woman being, in the quick progress from the foetal cell to maturity, a reproduction, in all essential respects, of the progressive steps that, through the ages, out of the world's earliest living organisms, evolved the first man.

And having thus fixed the mind, in the study both of the individual and of the species, upon these forms or organisms as they appear in the line of development, each graduating into a higher form, performing higher functions, the Haeckel school arrive at their *deduction*, that the whole process is physiological; that each graduation from lower to higher form was a physiological change only; that in the primitive cell, away back when the world's life began, and in the foetal cell with which each individual form of life now begins, a process began, purely material, that unaided by anything *apart* from the purely material has culminated in the man as he is to-day—the mental and moral man, as well as the material body that the mental and moral man inhabits.

This I say is what the school of Haeckel and other materialists *deduces*. Neither Haeckel nor any other materialist affirms that this conclusion is reached by any other process than that of inference or deduction. Mark these words—"inference," "deduction." They separate what belongs to, and is the product of, experiment and observation by the senses from what belongs to, and is the product of, reasoning *upon* what has been observed or experienced by the senses. No one, for instance, by any reunion of the chemical elements that make up the living organism, has ever yet artificially created life. That would be experiment observable by the senses. It is life that begets life; and in the whole domain of physics, plant and animal, no other way to beget life has been observed, not even the lowest forms of life. All that we know, then, through experimentation or from observation, of the earliest material cell and the life that animates it is, not that they are one and the same thing, but that they are *concomitants*; all that can be said, through experience or observation, of the advanced material organisms and an advanced state of life is, not that they are one and the same thing, but that they, too, are concomitants; and all that can be said of man, from any standpoint of experience or observation, is that, with him, his physical life and his soul-life are concomitants. But whether the concomitancy of the material cell with the life that animates it, and the concomitancy of the physical body of man with the soul that inhabits it, are due to life having its origin in the cell and the soul having its origin in the physical body, or whether life and soul are, in the last analysis, entities separate from the cell and body—the real entities of the universe—utilizing these material

forms as instruments only, as we utilize the telephone transmitter and receiver as instruments only, are, at most, deductions only, not facts scientifically established—*deductions that any school of belief may either accept or reject without rejecting any part of the array of facts that actual observation and experience have established.*

Imagine a human being so circumstanced that he had never known another human being—had never heard music or the human voice—coming suddenly into touch with a telephone, getting from its material organism the first and only note of music or sound of human voice that had ever come to him. Might not such lone man, with apparent reason, draw the deduction that music and voice were functions only of the organism; that, apart from that organism, there was no evidence of such a thing as music, no evidence of such a thing as human voice? And if, on investigating the organism before him closely, he discovered that any misadjustment interfered with or silenced the voices that came from it, and that in proportion as it was loosely put together, or was finely balanced, there issued sounds that were rudimentary only, and sounds that rose to the perfection of the finished voice, would he not have additional apparent reason for the deduction that the voices were but a function of the organism? Indeed, why, in the absence of wider knowledge or a deeper insight, should not this lone man conclude, from the manifest concomitancy of organism and sound, that sound and the organism before him had no separate existence—that one was in truth but the function of the other?

To the extent that we cannot see with our material eyes, or touch with our material fingers, or hear with our material ears, any soul-life apart from the material organism called "body" and "matter," we are in the situation of the lone man suddenly come upon the organism out of which sound and music issue. Is the physical organism, out of which these voices issue, the beginning and the end of the voice and the music? Why should the lone man, who has never heard a voice or music in any other connection, have any absolute scientific basis on which to answer, "No"? Is the physical organism called "the body of man," out of which seem to issue the wonderful something called "soul-life," and "the moral universe," the beginning and the end of soul-life, and the moral universe? Why should we who have never

seen with material eyes, or touched with material fingers, or heard with material ears, the thing called "soul-life," and "the moral universe," except in connection with the material organism, think we had any absolute scientific basis on which to answer, "No"? But, on the other hand, neither in the one case nor in the other is there any absolute scientific basis on which to answer "Yes." In both cases, the conclusion reached, whether it be one or the other, is a process, not of scientific observation, but of inference only, the deduction that the mind draws from given facts. And, that being the case, there is nothing in the present state of science that excludes *as unscientific* those who believe that soul and matter are distinct entities, any more than it excludes as unscientific those who believe that soul is only a function of matter; for from a purely scientific standpoint—the standpoint of materialistic science I mean—the question is still an open one, to be determined, so far as it can be determined, within the limits of man's knowledge, by that intelligent weighing of all the known facts that the mind must make use of in determining any of the debatable questions of this life.

Now, starting just where actual science has brought us, and rising from that into the field of deduction, which inference, that of the materialist, or that of the believer in soul-life as a separate entity from material life, is the most probable one? The array of facts in favor of the materialist is an interesting one. I have no space, further than already employed, to run over these facts. The one indicated—the scientific fact that both in the evolution of the species and of the individual, the development of certain organs connected with life seems to have come in the same order, and to have come concomitantly with the development of life and mind, is the matrix of them all. Not another fact in the whole array produced by the materialist rises to such a degree of convincingness as this. Not another fact in the whole array escapes the inconclusiveness of this. All of them borrow their logic from the inference to be drawn from the concomitancy of soul and matter in process of evolution—that because soul and matter have evolved concomitantly, and in the same physical embodiment, it is to be taken that soul *is* matter—that because the voices issuing from the telephone have, so far as the lone man knows, no origin except in the telephone, it must be taken as established, *as to him*, that the voices are of the telephone.

But let us turn to another array of facts, no less actual than the ones stated, that look exactly in the opposite direction. I shall only give the three that appeal to me most strikingly. The first of these is that there is in this universe such a thing as a Moral Plan. Let me illustrate this in some only of its more obvious relations. We are living in a time, for instance, when, for their material comfort, men have tapped deeply the secrets of nature. Are you seated in your house at midnight, engulfed in light? Are you, without any exertion of your own, carried, swiftly and lightly as the bird flies, over long distances, and by invisible pinions? Are the stars brought near you through the lenses of the telescope? Is sight restored to you through lenses produced at the optician's? Is every comfort from every clime brought every morning to your door? Are the heart and intellect of every age waiting to speak to you from your bookshelves? Do you perceive that in this throbbing, whirling, power-charged universe, every rein is falling into your hands? And do you look upon all these advances as the achievements of men? So they are; but you must add to this, to make the fact complete, that every capability of nature, just as we know it now, uninterruptedly has existed from the beginning, waiting only for the capability lodged in man to discover and possess it. And, add to this again that though the capabilities of nature existed from the beginning, only a hint of them was given to man—the race in its childhood, like the children of men under far-sighted teachers, being left to *work out* the problem; to evolve, by study and experiment, from the summer lightnings playing from cloud to cloud, the masterful electrical forces; to evolve by study and experiment, from the sands of the sea, the lenses that bring worlds together; to evolve, by study and experiment, the facilities that ore and coal and water give us; to evolve, by study and experiment, that most far-reaching of all things, the organization into a cohering whole of the sounds of the human voice that, put on paper, in the characters of the alphabet, have given the heart and intellect of every age a medium through which to speak. True, the law of the survival of the fittest applies to every step in the evolution of this material civilization. But that law does not account for the fact without which evolution would have no ground to begin on, that into nature *were put* these capabilities, and into man *was put* the corresponding capability to event-

ually uncover and utilize them; it does not account for the fact, every day becoming plainer, that into nature nothing has found way that is not a helpful force, present or future, in the economy of mankind. Now, such *adaptation* of capability to capability cannot be chance. Such adaptation is *purpose*. True, its development, step by step, is evolution. But it was not evolution that ordained the adaptation. Behind this composite machine of man and matter, each cog of the one engaging with a corresponding cog of the other, is intention, mind, purpose, moral plan; and all the more clearly is this brought out, and all the more clearly is the object of the purpose made, when we hold before us the fact that, though man and matter were thus adapted to each other from the beginning, it was left to man to *work out* the relationship, in order that man, himself created as we are told in the image of his Creator, might in a lesser degree, through the power working within him, become a creator also—might link his individuality with the Father individuality behind all things. I never contemplate this adaptation of nature, in all her recesses, to the uses of mankind, that I do not acknowledge the *certainty* and the *bountifulness* of the original Intention; and I never dwell on the fact that it required the effort of man to uncover and utilize it, that I do not acknowledge the *benevolence* of the Intention. We are not chance creatures. We are children for whose good all things have been ordered.

I have gone to this material side of moral plan in the universe only because it is the more obvious—is more easily understood. But it is not on that side of life and human history only that a moral plan is discernible. History is only a small part, probably, of the years of the human race. It only goes back to the time when men were far enough advanced to begin to create records. But take the whole of *historical mankind*—the race in its early tribal relations, living from hand to mouth, cruel as wild beasts, and almost as aimless, rising step by step to what it is now, all the riches of nature at its door, and all the forces of nature plastic in its hands, society governed by law, society taking care of the weak, justice more and more becoming the ideal toward which society strives, the best part of mankind living as if there *were* a God, a moral universe and future responsibility—does not such a history show that civilization and the race have grown up around some life-principle *higher* than its

mere material life; some purpose, some design, some plan for the orderly accomplishment of what has taken place, as distinguished from haphazard and chance? No one will deny that the tree or the blade of grass that, starting from a seed, grows and strengthens and then blossoms and ripens, has grown and strengthened and blossomed and ripened—the same phenomena occurring year after year, along the same lines—in accordance with an underlying life-principle. Is there no design, no plan, no life-principle behind our race's grasp of beauty, of justice, of the ideals that have worked out the greater plan, the very *grasp* of which is the blossoming and the ripening of all that has gone before? And does not this show that into matter, at some time, and from some source higher than matter, there enters moral principle—that concomitant with matter, but above it, there is purpose, plan, the adjustment of capabilities and of events, toward an end wholly different in kind from mere material ends?

The second great fact in the array is the universal *consciousness* of man that, behind this material panorama spread out before the eyes, there is something that gave it being—a something, too, to which each individual life in that being is responsible. I do not mean by this the universality of religion among men; that is a sequence only of the universal consciousness to which I refer. Nor do I mean the almost universal wish among men that there should be a future life; that, too, is only a sequence—along with religious phenomena, one of the things that manifest themselves because underneath, in the universal consciousness, there lies the insight, that in some way *sees* that mind is different from matter, and that behind matter is something, not itself matter, out of which mind and soul have emerged, and to which they are responsible.

Does that underlying consciousness mislead us? It has run through human nature of every race, and through all time. Is it a mere phantasm, the by-play of hope and the imagination? Let us test the inquiry by what the same kind of underlying consciousness means in those things with which we daily come in touch.

I will illustrate out of my own experience. Through almost sixteen years now, I have been hearing, from one end of the year to the other, judicial causes of almost every kind—causes that involve human emotions; causes that, escaping the field of emotions,

involve the law as the mere evolutionary means of the social safety and progress of mankind; and causes that, escaping both these, involve the laws of nature, mechanics, electricity and the like. Many of these causes have in their presentation been greatly clarified—many almost hopelessly jumbled; but, in every instance, no matter what the nature of the cause, or what the helpfulness of the presentation, the *first sight caught* of the right solution has been something in the nature of intuition or feeling, rather than conscious perception—the intuition, *underneath* reasoning, that points the way, leaving it to conscious reasoning to assure one that the way thus pointed out is indeed the right way. And what is this intuition, this feeling, this universal subconsciousness that rules every one, in every relation of life, but the sensitive plate through which environment imprints its meaning—the so-called “reasoning faculties” being the room only in which the plates are developed and put into order. And if this be true of the daily problems presented by our immediate environment, why is it not true also of the eternal problem presented by the greater environment, the greater problem presented by the question, Whence came we? and Whither are we going? Is not the difference of environment and question simply a difference in the magnitude and difficulty of the work of developing that which this latent consciousness holds? In the one case, as in the other, is not the latent consciousness *insight*—the thing that the soul *sees* in advance of reason catching up to classify and explain? And, as such, is it not just as much a fact in the universe of truth as any other established fact?

The third fact in my array is the fact that there is Unity in the world of Thought and Feeling, as well as in Nature. Let me illustrate again by something personal. I was once in a region where there were many springs, some on the mountainside, some in the valley, some pouring out great streams, some that were mere threads; but, whether large or small, whether on the mountainside or in the valley, they all rose and fell in unison, all had a common pulsation like the heaving and falling of a single bosom. To any student of past history or observer of contemporaneous events, the manifestations of mind, heart and conscience that characterize the movements of men disclose a like unity. True, what we call “exact knowledge” usually comes slowly, and from widely scattered sources. But not so with the

really great convictions and impulses of the world. These seem to burst forth everywhere at once, as the great fountain at Versailles bursts forth, every aperture, big or little, whether at the pinnacle or whether obscure, responding at once and according to its capacity. Indeed, to those who observe closely, and who have read discriminatingly, there is no fact more fully proven than that, behind thought and feeling, the world over, there is a common source, some central mind, some central heart, from which each individual mind, each individual heart, receives its pulsations.

Now, as a *premise* for *deduction*, each of these facts is just as much a scientific fact, and just as scientifically determinable, as the facts upon which, as premises, the school of materialists base their deductions; and upon them we can build deductions that have the same kind of scientific warrant that any mere deduction is entitled to claim. Indeed, the only respect in which the honest materialist differs from the believing world, is that the horizon of the materialist is a restricted horizon only; stops long before the limits of known facts are reached; and excludes everything, however clearly seen by the mind, that the material hand does not touch. All that the believing world asks of science and philosophy—and in so asking stands squarely on scientific ground—is that, before any deductions are finally accepted as conclusive, the horizon upon which they are predicated be enlarged to include every known fact.

And within this restricted horizon of the materialist—to sum it all up—what have we? A deduction that spirit and body are one, founded wholly on the premise that life, mind, heart and conscience have developed *concomitantly* with that part of matter that we find in the physical body—a deduction no more valid than the deduction of the lone man who had come across the telephone, that the voice and the telephone were one, because *to him* they were concomitant.

Within the larger horizon of the believer, what have we? Nature in all its apparent diversity disclosing plan; the Moral World disclosing plan; Nature stored from the beginning with forces—from the first fire struck by flint to the last wireless message sent across the seas—that would have been forever superfluous in the absence of man; the Moral World developing its ascending forces—beauty, charity, justice—that might as easily

have had their places taken by the descending forces had not an ascending mankind been in the centre of the plan. Nature yielding of its store only in response to man's thought and endeavor; in that way developing, as only exercise could develop, those fibres in the human race that have made material civilization possible; the Moral World unfolding its store only in response to the religious perceptions and better instincts of mankind; in that way developing in men, themselves, a part at least of the power that has lifted up mankind. Man the point toward which everything in Nature is directed; man the point upon which everything in the Moral World is centred.

And through it all, in the consciousness of mankind, as the ever-recurring note that forms the key to the composition, the persistent insight that, behind all this, there is an Intelligence, and a Love, that only the acceptance of man as the child of God can account for. So all we have to do is to recognize these voices as facts within the realm of Science, and like the lone man with the telephone, who eventually discovers that what he supposed was a part of the instrument is really behind and apart from the instrument, we will begin to see that *behind* the material body is something apart from the material body—something that, while speaking *through* the body as the instrument now at hand, is infinitely above the material body—Soul, not body, the real entity of the universe.

I have excluded from this paper every consideration based on Revelation or Faith. I have dealt with the subject as if there were no Inspired Word—as if the world knew nothing of a Son of Man who at the same time was a Son of God. But I do not wish it to be understood that this Jesus of Nazareth is not to me a sufficient foundation on which to rest, in abiding security, my belief in the world to come. When I turn over in thought the words some great man uttered to his contemporaries—a Cromwell, a Washington or a Lincoln—and then reflect what those words and that man subsequently accomplished, a new belief attaches to their truth and wisdom. And so it is also when I turn over in my mind the word given to us by this Jesus of Nazareth. He was born of parents who, but for Him, would have lived and died a mere carpenter and his wife. He never set foot outside a province of the Roman Empire that, in its day, was as little taken notice of, by the rest of the world, as is one of

the small islands of the Philippine Archipelago. And He passed out of this life unmentioned in any writing of His time, for the mention by Josephus is probably an interpolation. But His Life and His Word "have divided the world into two"; everything that has come after Him is His; everything that shall come after us increasingly His. More than all the other forces of civilization, more than the combined lives of the world's great men, His Life and His Word have remade the world. Why should not I, turning back as I often do, with a new faith to the words of the world's great men who have done great things, turn back to the Life and the Words of Him, who not only has done great things, but has *remade* the world, with an abiding faith in their inspired truth?

PETER S. GROSSCUP.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY AND THE NEAR EAST.

BY BRITANNICUS.

IMPELLED as much by the pressure of Germany as by "manifest destiny" or by an exclusive regard for her own interests, Austria-Hungary has steadily made her weight felt in the tangled scheme of Balkan politics. The ultimate goal of her aspirations is to find herself planted at Salonica; nothing less than that will content the forward school of Viennese Imperialists. The occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was the first long step to that end, the first, and until recently, almost the last. For nearly thirty years a combination of difficulties has held Austria back from all schemes of overt adventure. The internal distractions of the Dual Monarchy, serious enough in themselves and liable to be indefinitely multiplied, if, as the result of an Austrian advance upon Macedonia, some millions of intractable Slavs were to be added to the polyglot chaos of the Empire; the pacific and cautious temperament of Francis Joseph; the fear of Russia, which, without moving a man or a gun herself, could pour the Servians and Montenegrins upon the Austrian flank; the certainty that the conquest of Macedonia would raise the question of Albania in its acutest form, embroil Austria with Italy, and jeopardize and not improbably disrupt the Triple Alliance; and the crowning need for economy in the Imperial finances—have all condemned Austria-Hungary to a policy of obligatory conservatism. To keep things as they are "till all be ripe and rotten" has been her consistent principle. Thus every movement among the smaller Slav States towards economic or political union she has ruthlessly and instantaneously repressed, recognizing, and from her point of view quite rightly, that nothing could more imperil her present position and her future prospects than the growth of a formidable Slav kingdom in the Balkans, in league with Russia

and affiliated by ties of racial kinship and sentiment to many millions of her own subjects. Thus, too, she has made it a fixed object of her policy to keep Turkey weak and distracted, to foment discord in Macedonia and to hamper—it has been easily done—the European Concert in its work of reform.

It is only by keeping this dual objective in mind that the self-denying ordinance entered into in 1897 by Austria-Hungary and Russia can be appreciated. Momentarily deaf to the appeal of Pan-Slavism and absorbed in the Trans-Siberian railway, Russia was but too willing to conclude a compact that, without endangering her interests in the Balkans, would leave her a free hand in the Far East. Austria-Hungary, torn by internal dissensions and desiring nothing better than to see her mighty rival occupied on the Yellow Sea, was not less willing to meet Russia half-way. The two Powers agreed, accordingly, to maintain the *status quo* in the Balkans, to refrain from any schemes of conquest or aggression, and to respect the independence of the separate Balkan States. For the past ten years this agreement has been the basis of the Near Eastern situation. Up to last January it was observed on both sides with adequate fidelity. Russia, indeed, seemed for a time to have relinquished her traditional guardianship of the Balkan Slavs, and Austria, while busy as ever with sap and mine, abstained from any frontal attack on the *status quo*. When the misery of Macedonia became too poignant to remain any longer unheeded, the two Powers received from the Concert of Europe a mandate to carry out a common programme of “reform.” Some good was undoubtedly effected, but the spectacle of Austria and Russia ministering to the needs of Turkey was not unlike that of two jealous and not overscrupulous heirs called in to prescribe for a dying man. Neither Power really desired or worked for genuine reform. Both were equally concerned in prolonging the disease. Such benefits as actually accrued to the Macedonians were the result of the pressure and insistence of Great Britain, France and Italy. When these latter Powers, at the beginning of the present year, raised and pressed home the crucial questions of reforming the Macedonian judiciary and improving the *gendarmerie*, the Concert of Europe flew to pieces and the ten-year-old compact between Austria and Russia was abruptly dissolved.

It was Baron von Aehrenthal, the Austro-Hungarian Minister

for Foreign Affairs, who by a single decisive stroke shattered at once the unity, such as it was, of the Great Powers and the Austro-Russian Agreement. Behind the backs of his colleagues in the European Concert he negotiated with the Sultan for the right to build a railway through the sanjak of Novi-Bazar. By placing himself under special and secret obligations to the Turkish Government, at a moment when the Concert of Europe was engaged in a last desperate effort to maintain itself and coerce the Sultan, Baron von Aehrenthal deliberately isolated Austria-Hungary, destroyed the confidence which alone offered a chance of united action, made continued co-operation with Russia impossible and effectually blocked the path to all further reform. It is of the first moment to ascertain, if possible, the motives that prompted his action. Why did Austria-Hungary last February suddenly assume an initiative that had long been foreign to her Balkan policy, throw over Russia and ostentatiously separate herself from the Concert of Europe? There are, I think, several reasons that account for her conduct. In the first place it was becoming clear that an autonomous Macedonia, under the protectorate of the Powers, was the ultimate and inevitable solution of the Macedonian question. An autonomous Macedonia could only in the end mean a Macedonia in which the Bulgarians held the upper hand; and a Macedonia in which the Bulgarians held the upper hand would amount, as was pointed out at the time, to "a racial wall of concrete across the route to Salonica, shutting off the Hapsburg monarchy from the port upon which her revived naval ambition is now unmistakably fixed." In the second place the concession extracted from the Sultan of a railway through Novi-Bazar represented an object the attainment of which was indispensable to Austrian expansion in the southeast. A glance at the map will show why. Novi-Bazar is at once a wedge driven between Serbia and Montenegro and the easiest pathway of approach to Macedonia and Salonica. A railway through it, under Austrian control, would thus go far towards realizing two of the supreme aims of Viennese policy. It should still further divide the Serb race, and it would enormously facilitate the Austrian prospect of succeeding to Macedonia and of reaching the *Ægean*. It would achieve these two ends, moreover, without crossing Hungarian territory, and therefore without compromising that freedom of action which Austrian statesmen may con-

ceivably before long be obliged to assert even at the expense of their fellow subjects across the Leitha. By procuring, therefore, the right to link up the Bosnian railway system with the Turkish, Baron von Aehrenthal obtained for his country an asset of real strategic and political value. This, however, does not of itself explain why he set out to obtain it at the time and in the manner he did. Novi-Bazar is perhaps the most curious of the many curiosities of diplomacy. It was placed by the Congress of Berlin under the military occupation of Austria and the civil administration of Turkey, and among the rights assigned to Vienna was that of "having military and commercial roads" throughout the sanjak. None of his predecessors had thought of giving any practical application to these words in Article 25 of the Treaty of Berlin. Why, then, should Baron von Aehrenthal? What were the circumstances that induced him in February to resurrect an almost forgotten privilege and make it the basis for negotiating a railway concession?

The new influences that inspire and justify the new policy and the new assertive spirit are partly political and partly personal. Among the former I would give the first place to the reflex action of the introduction of universal suffrage. In a country so composite as Austria it was a venture of obvious and peculiar hazard, but it has abundantly succeeded. For the time being, it has flattened out racial jealousies and restored to political health and confidence a State that, but a few years ago, showed every symptom of creeping paralysis. Within the last thirty months there has been visible a startling accession of national strength and a pervasive concentration on the work of practical social reform. For the first time in three decades Austria finds herself no longer convulsed by racial feuds, no longer in the throes on interminable Parliamentary crises, but a harmonious, smooth-running State, capable of sustained and concerted action. Hungary, on the other hand, which has preyed incessantly on Austrian distractions and impotence, demanding fresh fiscal concessions and asserting her right to what was little less than military and economic independence, now finds herself embarrassed and at a disadvantage. The Magyars detest, and will do all they can to prevent, the introduction of any genuine scheme of universal suffrage into their half of the realm. They are acutely aware that it spells the doom of their racial and political ascendancy, and of the

social and commercial privileges that go with it. To Hungary the mere prospect of universal suffrage has brought infinite perplexity; to Austria its actual realization has brought an unwonted sense of union and stability. But the resurrection of Austria carries with it other than domestic consequences. A writer in the November number of the "Fortnightly Review" justly observes that the courses of internal and foreign affairs are more or less connected in every country, but nowhere so intimately as in the Dual Monarchy. An Austria racked by civil strife at home was an Austria incapable of strong action abroad. An Austria tranquil, hopeful and self-possessed is an Austria with both the desire and the ability to make herself felt abroad. The initiative which she has taken upon herself in the Balkans derives the impulse which makes it at once so formidable and so interesting from the happy change which has transformed her internal situation. Nor, as it happens, could she have timed her resurrection at a moment more auspicious for a policy of positive action. She worked her way from a seemingly hopeless malady to convalescence, and from convalescence to buoyant and tingling life, precisely at the moment when her great rival, Russia, was reeling through disasters abroad and revolution at home. While Austria was gathering strength and assurance, Russia was passing through a crisis that for many years to come must weaken, if not paralyze, her moral and material energy. Just when Vienna, after nearly half a century of passivity, felt stirred to self-assertion and expansion, St. Petersburg was grappling perforce with the wholly opposite problems of "peace, retrenchment and reform."

But the renaissance of Austria, and the temporary disablement of Russia, are not the only factors that have operated upon the recent diplomacy of the Ballplatz. They are linked with and reinforced by two other factors of a more personal but not less potent character. Austria is unique in the possession of two "dark horses." The heir-apparent, the Archduke Ferdinand, is one; Baron von Aehrenthal is the other. Both are newcomers in the field of international affairs; both are believed to share much the same views of Austria's internal and external policies; both have given proof from time to time of a strong and decisive personality, and both are called to high, one of them to the highest, positions in the service of their country; yet to Europe at large, and to their own people in only a slightly less degree, both

are unknown, enigmatical figures whose future courses and actions at once defy and invite speculation. It is only two years since Baron von Aehrenthal succeeded Count Goluchowski. But the two years have sufficed to refute nearly every forecast of his probable policy that was current in 1906. It was commonly expected of him that he would make it his first object to seek a broader accommodation between the Dual Monarchy and Russia. He was believed to be a Russophil on grounds which, sound or otherwise, were, at any rate, plausible enough to have earned for him the suspicions of Berlin. It was surmised that one of the results of his accession would be a certain stiffening in Austria-Hungary's attitude towards her acquisitive ally and, as its inevitable counterpart, a movement towards such an understanding between Vienna and St. Petersburg as had been effected between Rome and Paris. Count Goluchowski, by the stark coercion of his methods in the matter of the Servo-Bulgarian customs union, had left Austrian policy in Southeastern Europe an object of violent distrust. Here, again, it was thought likely that Baron von Aehrenthal would modify his predecessor's programme, and that while Austria was engaged in experimenting with a democratic franchise, and while the Magyars were engrossed with holding their own both against Austria herself and against the insurgent peoples around them, the Dual Monarchy as a whole would abstain from any policy of adventure or repression in the Balkans. Every one of these expectations has been proved to be baseless, and Europe is now alive to the fact that a new, redoubtable and wholly mysterious personality has emerged upon the stage of international politics with every apparent qualification and intention of playing thereon a commanding rôle. A German-Bohemian aristocrat by descent, a diplomatist by profession, the friend, confidant and literary executor of Count Kalnoky—who was not only an excellent judge of men, but an ardent believer in Austrian expansion southwards—the husband of Countess Szechenyi and through her in direct touch with Magyar thought and feeling, in appearance rather a professor than a statesman, tall, bespectacled, parchment-hued, of a slow, methodical suavity of manner, monotonously precise and unrhctorical in his form of address, a master of reserves and blessed with the gift of avoiding notice—Baron von Aehrenthal has shown himself the first Austrian Foreign Minister since Andrassy who gives promise of carrying on the great

traditions of Kaunitz and Metternich. Twenty years as *attaché* and Ambassador at St. Petersburg, where he made himself enviably popular, have given him a knowledge of Russian statesmen, policy and conditions that is probably unrivalled by any other European; and the central clue to his actions as Foreign Minister is unquestionably to be found in his conviction that Muscovite power for many years to come may be treated as a negligible quantity, and that now is the golden hour for Austria to steal a march on her rival in the Balkans. Baron von Aehrenthal, moreover, has proved that he can execute a policy as well as frame it. Within the past two years he has separated Serbia and Bulgaria; he has breathed a new vigor into the Triple Alliance; he has, in effect, though not in words, denounced the Austro-Russian Agreement; the speech of last January in which he defended the Novi-Bazar concession revealed a vast and co-ordinated plan for building and expanding Austrian power in the Balkans on the bedrock of railway development; he has raised Austria from the position of Germany's satellite to one of leadership and independence; and within the last two months he has torn up the Treaty of Berlin by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina.

What enormously adds to the significance of these achievements is the belief that Baron von Aehrenthal was selected for his present post by the heir-apparent, that he is the Archduke Ferdinand's right-hand man, and that the policies he has initiated are the policies to which Francis Joseph's successor will lend the full weight of Imperial support. This, I say, is the belief, but as even in Vienna itself you will hear twenty different versions from twenty equally well-informed observers of the Archduke's political views, character, ambitions and activities, it cannot be called a certainty. The balance of evidence and of probability, however, inclines decidedly to the opinion that the Archduke, to whom the Emperor is more and more surrendering the guidance of affairs, is the true inspirer as well as the enthusiastic backer of the new forward policy; and it is not inconceivable that he looks forward to uniting it with the realm of the Hapsburgs remodelled, and perhaps extended, on a Federal basis. We have seen, therefore, that long before the Turkish revolution many forces were at work urging Austria to assume a more vigorous and prominent part in Balkan politics, and that several months before the plans of the Young Turks were even suspected by

Europe the Ballplatz had furnished decisive proof that the days of Austria's subordination and inactivity were over and that a period of calculated aggressiveness had begun. On a sudden, however, it seemed as though the new policy might be wrecked before it was fairly launched. The Hamidian despotism disappeared in a day. The prospect of a strong, united Turkey and of a tranquillized Macedonia became an incredible reality. In Vienna and Berlin alike the developments were watched with something akin to consternation. Every proof that accumulated of the absolute downfall of the old régime, every sign that was forthcoming of the moderation and capacity of the Young Turks, was another death-blow to Austrian and German influence and to long-cherished, fast-maturing designs of commercial and political exploitation. Let it be said at once that a Turkey strong enough to stand alone is neither an Austrian nor a German interest, and that all the resources of the diplomacy of both Powers have been, and will continue to be, directed against its formation. Both Vienna and Berlin were quick to see that it was not Abdul Hamid alone whose power was gone, and that the advent of constitutionalism meant the collapse of the whole Austro-German scheme of cajolery, intrigue and browbeating for economic, political and territorial ends. It was clear even to duller eyes than those of Baron von Aehrenthal that a pacified Macedonia left little scope for the arts of the *agent provocateur*, and that a reorganized and regenerated Turkey, allied, as in the long run it infallibly would be, with the power of Bulgaria, would interpose a fatal barrier to any advance on Salonica. To humiliate the Young Turks, to foment reaction, if possible to bring their precarious régime clattering to the ground, became therefore at once a prime object of Austria's policy. Its achievement was not difficult. The authority and prestige of the Young Turks, it was confidently expected, would be irreparably damaged if the first result of their accession were to be the loss of portions of the Ottoman Empire. To instigate, applaud and second the declaration of Bulgarian independence and to proclaim the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina were the means that immediately suggested themselves.

Nobody denies the excellence of Austria's administration of the two provinces that were handed over to her by the Congress of Berlin. It has been a civilizing work of the first order, successful in almost everything that can be seen and tabulated, but

not successful in winning the affections of the people. Nobody, again, denies that the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, while technically temporary, had, in fact, become permanent, and that the chances of their ever again passing back into Turkish hands had ceased to exist. Nor will it be contested that the demand for autonomy in the two provinces, long persisted in and greatly stimulated by the grant of universal suffrage in Austria-Hungary and by the unlooked-for triumph of constitutionalism in Turkey, had become at once most difficult to resist and yet impossible to grant, so long as any doubt remained as to whether they formed part of the Hapsburg or the Ottoman dominions. Nor, finally, is it open to dispute that during the past two or three years the ideal of Greater Serbia has been pressed with unwonted determination; that it is an ideal which profoundly moves some nine millions of people, two-thirds of whom are Austro-Hungarian subjects; that in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where all the inhabitants are Serbs, though Serbs of different faiths, in Croatia, in Novi-Bazar, in Dalmatia, and in Serbia and Montenegro, the Serbs have been drawing together on a basis of mutual revolutionary agitation against Austrian and Magyar ascendancy; and that the nightmare of the statesmen of Vienna—the formation, namely, of a great Slav community on the southern flank of the realm of the Hapsburgs—was beginning to acquire a disturbing reality. All this is beyond question, and in judging Baron von Aehrenthal's action full allowance must be made for it. Especially must we remember that Bosnia and Herzegovina lie at the very centre of Serb distribution, and are therefore most susceptible to the recrudescence of Serb nationalism.

What do these considerations amount to? They amount, I think, to this: that the formal incorporation of Bosnia and Herzegovina into the Hapsburg dominions had become, or was fast becoming, quite apart from the Turkish revolution, a political necessity. My information is that it would not in any case have been long delayed, and that the upheaval in Constantinople merely hastened and altered the manner of its advent. But for the complications induced by that amazing event, it is more than probable that the annexation of the two provinces would have been amicably negotiated between Vienna and Constantinople, with every formality of deference to the other Powers that signed the Treaty of Berlin. The triumph of the Young Turks pre-

precipitated what had already become virtually inevitable, forced Baron von Aehrenthal's hand and provided him with an opportunity for striking simultaneously at the Serbs and the new rulers in Constantinople. He acted with masterly decision and comprehensiveness. By seconding Prince Ferdinand's proclamation of independence, he made it impossible for Bulgaria to join hands with the Serbs in resisting Austria's own violation of the Treaty of Berlin. By handing back Novi-Bazar to Turkey he achieved the semblance of compensation without any real sacrifice of Austrian interests. If the *coup* had to be executed one may, at least, be permitted the remark that it could not have been executed more adroitly. Its effects will be many and enduring. The tornado of passionate resentment that swept through Serbia and Montenegro when they beheld their supreme racial aspirations dashed to pieces, and the Greater Serbia of their dreams placed forever beyond all hope of realization may not—I believe will not—lead to war, but neither, on the other hand, will it pass away without accentuating every element of Austro-Russian antagonism. It may, indeed, prove in the end that the possibility of a Greater Serbia, so far from being wrecked or delayed, has been positively furthered; that representative institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina will exercise an irresistible attraction over the Southern Slavs and furnish them with a new centre of gravity; and that the Hapsburg sceptre will ultimately extend over a Federalized monarchy in which Serbia and Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Dalmatia will form a component State. Some such calculations as this may have been working in the minds of Archduke Ferdinand and Baron von Aehrenthal. Some such premonition as this may account for the instinctive hesitation of the Magyars in applauding the annexation. That, however, is a matter for the future to settle in its own incalculable way. It is enough for the present that Austria by a single stroke should have outraged Slav sentiment both in Russia and the Balkans, should have torn up in her own interests a great international compact, should have estranged the confidence of Western Europe, and should have dealt the new régime in Turkey a staggering, it may be a fatal, blow. These and the annexation of the two provinces, and a new consciousness of capacity for the diplomatic initiative, are the outstanding results of her recent *coup*.

BRITANNICUS.

BULGARIA AND THE TREATY OF BERLIN.

BY SVETOZAR TONJOROFF.

THERE was a lively commotion at the British, French and Russian chancelleries as the luncheon hour was approaching, on October 5th of the present year. The digestion of statesmen was gravely menaced by the receipt of cipher messages from Bulgaria, which conveyed the news that at eleven o'clock in the forenoon of that day Prince Ferdinand, in Tirnovo, the ancient capital of the Bulgarian Tsars, had proclaimed the complete independence of his country and had torn to shreds the paper bonds that Europe had imposed upon the principality thirty years earlier, at the Congress of Berlin. The act was disquieting to the official mind. It constituted a reversal of the expert judgment of statesmen, and especially of the expert judgment of Lord Beaconsfield and Prince Bismarck, who at the Congress had concentrated the combined influence of Great Britain and Germany upon the task of placing a permanent check upon the future growth of the vassal state which they were creating. The two dominant plenipotentiaries—the Prussian *Junker* and the English Jew—had pledged the power of Germany and the wealth of Britain to prevent the establishment of a Russian advance-post in the Balkans. They had decreed that the Bulgarians should be divided, like ancient Gaul, into three parts—the principality of Bulgaria, to be a vassal to Turkey; the province of Eastern Roumelia, to be governed by its people under a Governor-General appointed by the Sultan; and the three vilayets known by the historic name of Macedonia, to be administered directly by Turkey under a modified system of autonomy. To this arrangement all the great Powers of Europe—some coerced by a show of force and others bribed by offers of actual or prospective advantages—affixed their signatures. Having achieved the famous gerry-

mander and created a new Poland, Prince Bismarck and Lord Beaconsfield thanked the Congress for its devotion to the cause of peace and dissolved it, serene in the conviction that they had changed the course of history with a stroke of the pen.

But the ink was hardly dry upon the parchment when forces which Bismarck and Beaconsfield had utterly failed to gauge began to operate, silently yet irresistibly, to undo that which had been done. One of these forces was the sturdy and independent character of the Bulgarian people. Another was the lamentable inability of the Osmanli race to conform to the requirements of civilization. Yet another was the failure of Russian diplomacy to grasp a few simple facts of history.

Muscovite statesmen, as if eager to confirm the worst suspicions of Disraeli, began to treat the people whom their arms had just liberated, in a manner that smacked but too strongly of a protectorate by the grace of the boot. The high-handed methods employed by Russian agents in Bulgaria quickly convinced the Bulgarians that between them and their cousins-german of the North a deep gulf was fixed. Two years after the liberation, the liberators were regarded at Sofia as a national peril, to be opposed to the utmost. In 1882, the gallant Alexander of Battenberg, first Prince of Bulgaria, rent asunder the leading-strings of Russia by announcing his adherence to the constitution which the Russians had sought to abrogate—in accord, undoubtedly, with the cynical *bon mot* of Prince Gortchakoff, the Russian plenipotentiary at the Congress of Berlin, who is recorded to have said, in discussing the sacred character of constitutions: “*Une constitution, c’est comme une belle femme: elle n’est faite que pour être violée.*” Alexander’s declaration of independence marked the end of Russian domination in Bulgarian affairs.

The Ottoman Empire did its part to carry out the mandate of history and to keep the sentiments of patriotism and resentment keen and hot in Bulgaria. Sultan Abdul Hamid II demonstrated his contempt for the treaty which had saved his empire in Europe, by promptly violating every one of its provisions which it lay in his power to violate. He began by declining to introduce even a semblance of reforms in Macedonia and Armenia. He ended by setting race against race in the European vilayets, in a destructive struggle that culminated in a European intervention with a scheme of international control.

The continuous state of anarchy in Macedonia exerted a powerful and unforeseen influence upon the temper and the aspirations of the Bulgarians. It imposed upon the people of the principality the necessity of organizing and maintaining a strong army which, in the course of time and events, might be in a position to right the wrongs that were being inflicted upon their brothers by blood, language and faith under Turkish misrule. The contrast between conditions in the principality and the adjoining Turkish vilayets is thus described by the late Emile de Laveleye in 1887, nine years after the liberation of Bulgaria:

“What a difference between this hell [Macedonia] and freed Bulgaria! Unhappily, the condition of the Bulgarians in Macedonia is now even more fearful . . . because the Turks and Greeks, fearing the formation some time of a great Bulgaria, join their hatreds and powers of injury to repress, and, if possible, to extirpate, the Slav element.”

Such was the situation that confronted the people of the principality. They took up the task of the future with zeal. Conscripts hastened to the colors with the exaltation of devotees. The military uniform became the symbol of the country's hope. At the news of each fresh excess in Macedonia, the free people of Bulgaria gritted their teeth—and were reconciled anew to the staggering burden of militarism which they had assumed voluntarily, with a cheerful devotion to a cause. All this went on under the surface. Outwardly, the Bulgarians were patient, as is their wont. Occasionally, a flash of temper in the “Peasant State” reminded the world of the harvest of dragons' teeth that was being sown in Macedonia by the hand of Abdul Hamid. The European chancelleries from time to time received a protest from Bulgaria against the continuance of the state of terror in the neighboring territory. The chancellors read these memoranda—and yawned. Sometimes they did not take the trouble to read them. It became a fixed idea in the collective mind of European diplomacy that these disorders were being fomented by Bulgaria for her own purposes—that the Bulgarians of the principality were effecting the extermination of their brothers beyond the boundary so as to keep up a convenient grievance!

Meanwhile, interesting events were casting their shadows before in Eastern Roumelia. The Bulgarians in that province—who then constituted five-sixths of a population of a little less than a million and a half—were organizing a movement for

union with Bulgaria. The agitation reached its climax on September 18th, 1885, when the Roumelians sent a delegation to the palace of the Turkish Governor-General to invite that official to leave the country. The delegation called at the *konak* in Philippopolis at two o'clock in the morning. Gavril Pasha Krustevitch, aroused out of sleep, rubbed his eyes, cast a hurried glance at the troops massed before his windows—and bowed low to the will of the people. On the following day, Prince Alexander, responding to the call of the Roumelians, entered Philippopolis at the head of two or three regiments of Bulgarian troops, and proclaimed the union of the two Bulgarias, North and South, an accomplished fact. The Sultan, restrained by international considerations from going to war, consented to a "regulation" of the existing situation by appointing Prince Alexander Governor-General of Eastern Roumelia for a term of five years. Then came, in quick succession, a declaration of war against Bulgaria by Servia as champion of the balance of power; the decisive defeat of the Servians at Slivnitza, at Nish, at Pirot, and the halting of the victorious Bulgarians on the road to Belgrade by a threat of Austrian intervention.

The war and its wholly unexpected outcome demonstrated two facts which produced an impression upon the world and foreshadowed the course of destiny on the Balkan Peninsula. One of these facts was the hitherto unsuspected capacity of the Bulgarians for organization. The other was their inevitable preponderance among the small states of the peninsula. When Russian intrigue finally brought about the abdication of Prince Alexander, by this time the idol of his people, the crisis failed to affect the permanence of things in the country. The regency that was created in 1887 to take over the Government demonstrated, under the aggressive leadership of Stefan Stambouloff, the "Bismarck of the Balkans," the determination of the Bulgarians to be neither Russian protégés nor Turkish vassals. By a series of brilliant moves upon the chess-board of diplomacy, Stambouloff rejected the last vestige of Russian guardianship. To do this, he found it necessary to execute the death sentence upon a few of the agents who had been sent out of St. Petersburg to promote disorders in the country. These details of the policy of defence were denounced by Russia, with an appropriate display of indignation, as acts of barbarism. Stambouloff retorted by

handing over to the European press copies of letters bearing the signatures of Russian diplomats—notably those of M. Yonine, consul-general at Sofia, and M. Hitrovo, minister at Bucharest—which disclosed the fantastic methods of Muscovite statecraft.

While he was checking the activities of Russia on the one hand, the “Bismarck of the Balkans” was playing a masterly game with Turkey on the other. When Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha was elected by the *Sobranje* at Tirnovo to the vacant throne, he found that the theoretically vassal state had already established an actual sovereignty among the nations of the earth. At Constantinople, the Bulgarian agent was a recognized member of the diplomatic corps. A similar position was accorded to Bulgaria at Paris, at London, at Vienna. The signatories of the Treaty of Berlin had winked broadly at that provision of the preposterous instrument which bound a European nation to the chariot-wheels of an Asiatic despotism. The work of Prince Bismarck and Lord Beaconsfield was crumbling under the weight of the logic of events.

But all that had been accomplished in Bulgaria up to 1887 was preliminary to the work that awaited Prince Ferdinand, who, during the twenty-one years of his occupancy of the palace at Sofia, has displayed an energy in action and a power of control in inaction, that have marked him as a person to be reckoned with in the final solution of that riddle of statesmen, the Eastern Question. The grandson of Louis Philippe, at the very outset of his reign, was confronted by a combination of unfavorable circumstances which might well have caused even a man of his unusual endowment of courage and resolution to hesitate before the undertaking. Russia withheld her recognition from the new Prince of Bulgaria because the Bulgarians had laughed to scorn the candidacy of an Asiatic khan, whose pretensions to the princely throne had received the endorsement of official personages on the Neva. Turkey refused to recognize him, because the vassal had seen fit to elect a prince without consulting the suzerain. The rest of the Powers suspended judgment while they awaited the issue. The situation required tact of the highest order.

Prince Ferdinand, even before the echoes of the “*Te Deums*” and the salvoes of artillery that had welcomed him to the country had died out, settled down to work. He had the aid of patriotic ministers and of a gracious lady—his mother, the Princess Clem-

entine, whose name is now a kindly memory in the country of her adoption. The people as one man worked with their prince, constructing a great network of national railways, developing a prosperous foreign commerce, perfecting a public-school system that is fast eliminating illiteracy, building up an army organization which has opened the eyes of the world by its efficiency and by its intense devotion to the cause that brought it into being. Every barrack became a school, not only for the study of the arts of war, but also for instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic. At every army post was established a schoolroom, where, in the evening, the recruits from the farms and the pastures were taught their letters by the young officers—themselves for the most part taken from the plough and the threshing-floor—who in the daytime had taught them how to shoot straight and defend the country “from internal and external foes.”

By 1893, Prince Ferdinand had achieved the preliminary success of his reign. Bulgaria had become “regular” in an international sense. Russia had reconciled herself to the inevitable. So had Turkey. So had the other Powers. Incidentally, a change had been effected by imperceptible degrees in the status of Eastern Roumelia. True, Prince Ferdinand still held the Governorship of the former Turkish province by appointment from His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, but it had come to be well understood at Constantinople that the nomination of any other prince to the post would require something more than an imperial *irade* to make it effective. Abdul Hamid preferred not to try the experiment. He was not prepared to employ force. Therefore, he permitted matters to drift until even the formality of appointment was discontinued at Yildiz, and Bulgarian possession of Eastern Roumelia acquired sanction as a formally recognized fact. The province ceased to be called Eastern Roumelia. It became South Bulgaria. The Bulgarians, in effect, had wiped out one of the boundaries which the gentlemen at Berlin had traced upon the map in an effort to keep them divided—and consequently ineffective.

Another arbitrary boundary remains to be obliterated. It is the line that separates the Bulgarians of the new Tsardom from their brothers in the three vilayets of Macedonia. Under the provisions of the Treaty of San Stefano, which the Powers at Berlin replaced with the Bismarck-Beaconsfield scheme of partition, the

greater part of Macedonia was included within the boundaries of the principality. The Bulgarian state was placed within reach of an outlet to the Mediterranean, *viâ* the Ægean Sea. With such a gateway for their commerce, the Bulgarians would ere now have solved the Macedonian problem after a prompt fashion of their own, and the Eastern Question never would have troubled the slumbers of statesmen. The Treaty of San Stefano, however, had accomplished its moral purpose, despite its summary abrogation. It had created the ideal toward which the Bulgarians have aimed ever since their liberation, and will continue to aim until they shall have achieved it. The "Great Bulgaria" is the watchword of minister, soldier and peasant alike. It is the Shibboleth of politics, the test of patriotism, the inspiration under which farmers and townsmen send their sons to the regiments and their taxes to the treasury without a murmur of discontent. It is the end toward which the energies of the nation are bent with a singleness of purpose which somehow recalls the development of Japan from a fairy-tale to a menace and the stolid growth of Prussia from a geographical term to a colossus.

Nowhere is it better realized than at Sofia that upon the solution of the problem of Macedonia hinges the future of the Balkan Peninsula. The people of Bulgaria, during the thirty years of their freedom, have spared neither labor nor treasure in the work of maintaining the life of their nationality across the frontier. The Macedonians, under the grotesque Ottoman administration, are taxed heavily for the support of schools; but the schools are never granted. They pay outrageously large amounts for public improvements; but these improvements are never vouchsafed. They stagger under a load of imposts for the upkeep of a civil service system, a judiciary and a police; yet the Turkish Government, despite its solemn undertakings under the Treaty of Berlin, has never given the population the elementary guarantees of existence—security of life and property, without which no progress is possible. Under these discouraging circumstances the Macedonians have looked to the principality for aid and comfort. If the Bulgarian schools in Macedonia have been developed largely with funds from Bulgaria, it is because the sentiment of race unity has been the key-note to the policies of the principality from the moment of its inception. If Bulgaria from time to time has been overrun by refugees from Macedonia, involving a heavy

drain upon the treasury and upon the resources of private charity, it is because the Macedonians recognize in the new Tsardom their natural protector.

The difficulties of the problem presented by the determination of the Bulgarians to unite with their neighbors are keenly appreciated by Tsar Ferdinand and his advisers. There are no illusions at Sofia concerning the profundity of Austria's desire for Salonica. Neither have Bulgarian statesmen failed to take account of Italian, Servian and Greek pretensions. But all these obstacles to the realization of the ideal of "Great Bulgaria" are not regarded as insurmountable. The history of the Tsardom has shown conclusively that the unexpected is by no means the impossible in the Balkans. Before 1885, a prophecy that Bulgaria in that very year would acquire Eastern Roumelia, without firing a shot, would have reflected badly upon the prophet's repute for sanity. Before October 5th of this year, the forecaster who should have undertaken to predict that Bulgaria would declare its independence of Turkey without bringing on a Balkan war, would have been laughed to scorn as a dreamer of fantastic dreams. Yet both events are a part of the archives of the chancelleries.

There are indications that the Bulgarian Foreign Office discerns the day drawing nigh when the grouping of the Powers will be such as to give to Tsar Ferdinand a free hand in the solution of the Macedonian problem. That problem, be it remembered, is not nearly so complicated as the vociferous claims of contending politicians might make it appear. The Bulgarians constitute a clear majority of the population of Macedonia. The Greek propaganda, despite its noisy manifestations, is a purely exotic movement. The best proof of the fact that the weakness of the Greek position in Macedonia is thoroughly realized at Athens, is to be found in the bitter opposition which the Greek agitators have offered to the suggestion, repeatedly made by the Bulgarians, that the question of race preferences in the three vilayets be referred to a plebiscite of that territory, to be conducted under international auspices in order to assure an untrammelled expression of sentiment. If the Greeks are even partly sincere in their contention that Macedonia is inhabited by a predominantly Greek population, why do they not accept the conclusive test to which they have been challenged?

The Italian pretensions to a part of Macedonia need not be considered seriously, because they rest upon no ethnological basis, and, moreover, are completely offset by rival Austrian claims. No district in Macedonia is inhabited even partly by a people of Italian origin or Italian traditions. Italy figures in the speculation merely as a self-appointed protector of the Albanians—who, however, neither speak an Italian dialect nor show any other sign of race-kinship with the people of the Italian Peninsula. The Servian propaganda is not so completely devoid of convincing characteristics as the Italian, but it is confined to the vilayet of Kossovo, known as “Old Servia.” To territory beyond that even the most chauvinistic among the Serbs lay no claim.

The only logical heirs to the gateway into the *Ægean*, then, are Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria. Austrian designs upon Salonica are inspired exclusively by military and economic considerations. The statesmen at Vienna are frankly waiting for the psychological moment. So are the Bulgarians, who rest their case confidently upon the argument that the numerically dominant unit in the population of Macedonia is Bulgarian by blood, language and sympathies. They point, for the benefit of their Austro-Hungarian rivals, to the fact that the digestive system of the Dual Empire is already overloaded with racial incompatibilities. There are not lacking, even in Austria, men who gravely fear that the coming attack of acute indigestion will begin at the bier of Franz Josef.

It is firmly believed at Sofia that the problem of the Near East will never be solved for good until it is solved upon ethnic lines. It was Cavour who said, during the period of Italy's struggle for unification, that the problem of nationalism was the dominant factor in the political life of his epoch. Tsar Ferdinand, and the Bulgarian nation as a unit behind him, hold the unalterable conviction that the same principle must rule in the affairs of to-day, and that the Eastern Question ultimately will be disposed of with due regard to legitimate race-aspirations and in conformity with the inexorable logic of history. Meanwhile, with untiring industry and infinite patience, Bulgaria has achieved the prologue to the drama that is yet to be played upon the Balkan stage.

SVETOZAR TONJOROFF.

LYOF N. TOLSTOY.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

At eighty a man has so well-nigh finished his work that it may be considered as something definite. He then "has lived," as the Romans preferred to phrase the great final fact, and if he continues to exist, it is because his work lives for him in such praise and blame as the nearer future may then give it as fitly as the further future. In such commemoration of Lyof N. Tolstoy's eightieth birthday as any friend of his may offer, this study of the reasons of his fame may not be the least tribute of affection and gratitude.

The century in which Tolstoy mostly lived and mostly wrought had among its many great names few more memorable than his, if it had any. There was Napoleon and there was Lincoln, and then there was Tolstoy in an order which time may change, though it appears to me certain that time will not change the number of these supreme names.

Since I have set them down here they have suggested to me a sort of representative unity in their relation to one another. If you fancy Napoleon the incarnation of the selfish force which inspired and supported his own triumphant enemies in their reaction against progress; if you suppose Lincoln the type of humanity struggling toward the ideal in the regeneration of the world's polity, you may well conceive of Tolstoy as the soul's criticism of the evil and the good which, however wholly or partially they knew it, the others imperfectly did. The work of Lincoln was no more final than the work of Napoleon; and like Napoleon's and like Lincoln's, Tolstoy's work has been without finality. So far as I can perceive, it has even been without effect in a civilization which calls itself Christian, but which has apparently been no more moved by the human soul as it was

in Tolstoy than by the divine spirit as it was in Christ. At first, indeed, the world was startled by the spectacle of a man of the highest rank, of a most ancient lineage, of great wealth, of renown in arms and in letters, putting from him fame and ease and honor, and proposing literally to obey the word of God, by making himself as one of the least of the brethren of Christ. It was a very curious sight, a bit droll, rather mad, wholly extraordinary. The world could hardly believe its eyes. It rubbed the sleep of two thousand years out of them at the sound of this voice crying in the wilderness, this voice that had so charmed it in fable, and bidding it prepare the way of the Lord and make His paths straight. Some tears came into its eyes, and some smiles; but after a while its lids fell again, and all was as before. The event, one of the greatest in the history of mankind, has been without perceptible effect in civilization.

On this side the teaching and the living of Tolstoy have been a failure so utter, so abject, that the heart sickens in considering it. An enemy might say that it could come to nothing better, for it was altogether lacking in originality; it was merely the living and the teaching of Christ over again, or if it had initiative in anything it was in the eschewment of some easings and pleasures in life which Christ permitted himself, or others, as harmless. An enemy might reason that this new ascetic was as illogical in the terms upon which he proposed regeneration as he was in the means he employed; and, in fact, the position of Tolstoy was full of illogicality. He proposed to himself poverty, but poverty without the fear of want is the least of hardships; he would give himself to work with his hands, but that was, so far as it went, taking the bread out of the mouths of those who needed the pay for the work of their hands; he dedicated himself to the good of others, as if it could be well to bestow the happiness which he refused; he would deny himself a soft bed and a luxurious board, but how many in all ages had fared simply and lain hard! He was defended from the consequences of his precept and his practice by the inalienable wealth of his family, the inalienable affection of the sovereign for the name and memory of his race. He was safe amidst his renunciations, and his protestations; he could freely do and say things for which the really poor and humble must suffer hunger and prison and exile. It was undeniably grotesque, but it was also pathetic, almost the most

pathetic predicament in history for a noble and sincere and unselfish man. Yet it excited mainly derision, though the actor in the involuntary drama again and again disclaimed and deplored it, and humbly besought those who witnessed it at close range not to regard it as his ideal. Once, to an interviewer, out of those scores and hundreds of interviewers who have swarmed upon him and reported his willing or unwilling words, he turned with the entreaty that he should not be taken as supposing that his life was conformable to his doctrine. It was what he could make it, the best he could make it, on the conditions he had accepted. He has said that he sometimes regretted not having really impoverished himself, though to do it he must have compelled the assent of those whom he had not the heart or perhaps the right to compel. He asked to be regarded as a man staggering through the dark, and often stumbling and falling down, but struggling up and staggering on again.

In this he showed a humility more genuine and precious than all that his simplification, his vowed and voluntary poverty, had graced him with. But the prophet who owns to human weakness, to human frailty of will and action, while he preaches fortitude and renunciation, will hardly have a following. There is no sect of Tolstoyans, there are no disciples or apostles. A few just people in England have gathered in a small community for the practice and the publication of his teaching, his interpretation and application of the doctrine of Christ. But I know of no other embodied acceptance of Tolstoy in an age when Mormonism holds its own, and Eddyism spreads among millions of comfortable people, cheerful in the least and lowest of the least spiritual precepts of the gospel, and more eager to save their bodies than their souls alive. There may be, indeed, a tacit and occult effect from the Tolstoyan morality for which it is yet too early to look, but which may hereafter show itself in a renewed and revitalized Christianity. That end is all that he could hope or wish; and there must have come to him from many hearts a response, oftenest despairing and self-accusing, where his words have awakened a conscience which—

“Not poppy or madragora

Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world
Can ever medicine to that sweet sleep”

which they “owed yesterday.” This conscience is the sense of

fealty to the eternal and universal human brotherhood, in which there is no high, no low, no better, no worse, no worthy, no unworthy, but only the bond of duty and the tie of love; and in whomsoever Tolstoy's words have awakened it, there is awakened the wish to do plainly and simply the plain and simple will of Christ.

In the hours of disappointment and impatience which he must have passed through, such a result, if he had been aware of it, must have been his sufficient consolation. Being supported in his self-sacrifice and his mission of self-sacrifice by no fanatical frenzy, by no pretence to divine authority which the gospel of Christ does not confer upon all, he doubtless needed this consolation. It has been stupendous, but not wonderful, how his precept and his practice have been misconstrued. Some such misconstruction is the lot of all the prophets whether they convince or confound their time. The greatest of them, Christ Himself, was misconstrued, first in His defeat and then in His triumph. The earliest Christians, who endeavored only for a life of love, peace and purity, were reputed guilty of every wickedness and filthiness. The world has got so far beyond this shabby state of suspicion and accusal, that nothing wrong could be believed of the life of this latest of the earliest Christians, but of his faith all things were misimagined. If any one, with the cloudy impression which most people have of this, will go to Tolstoy's books, he will be hardly less than astonished to find how little is expected of him there in the much that is asked of him. What Tolstoy asks of any one is that he shall keep trying to be like Christ; that he shall make this his ideal and perpetually endeavor to realize it in his conduct, though he shall and needs must fail to attain it. He asks this as Christ Himself asked His followers to be perfect even as their Father in heaven was perfect, knowing that more than the constant endeavor for that perfection was impossible. Tolstoy is otherwise apparently self-contradictory enough. In one place he supposes a devoted pair, who dedicate themselves to a life of good works, renouncing their worldly wealth and going down among the very poorest and foulest and basest, whom in the relentless logic of their self-sacrifice, they suffer to prey upon them and befoul them and infect them, till they end by being effectively in hell: hell here, though heaven hereafter. In another place he declares that he

"peacefully and joyously lives, and peacefully and joyously is approaching death" because he professes the Christianity which coincides with truth; yet so far as he may he is practising the precepts by which that devoted pair end in hell upon earth: the hell of futile endeavor for the good of others, which still he urges as the supreme object of the Christian life. That is, he urges it as the ideal, which must never be lost sight of though it may never be attained.

If you will read this saying in the light of his essay on "Life" it will not be hard, for there he shows the impossibility of the personal happiness which we are always longing for and striving for. Personal happiness is an unworthy end, which you fail of as you fail of personal righteousness, the worthiest end, the supreme ideal, the identification of the human with the divine. Yet this identification will be the destiny of the righteous man after death, when his human shall be merged in the divine; though what becomes of the unrighteous man we are not told. Perhaps it is felt that we are not concerned with the bad, the good being bad enough. Perhaps the way of the unrighteous man to such immortality is through his identification with all humanity first, and in his unity with the worst or the indifferent good, the righteous will prevail for the unrighteous. Tolstoy does not say that; he is chary of promising reward; but he says and he shows that the selfish life, the individual, the personal life, is always misery and despair, and, except for some moments of mad oblivion, is constant suffering. Some of the most beautiful, the most wonderful, passages of his fiction, both that which is real and that which is ideal in terms, embody events in which he seizes and perpetuates the heavenly rapture of a supreme act of self-sacrifice, of identification. The imagination has never gone farther than in these portrayals of mystical ecstasy; in them, indeed, the human consciousness of the original and final divine is suggested as no polemic could urge it.

Those who with Tourguénief regret that Tolstoy did not leave prophesying and resume imagining may say that here is proof of the greater power he could have had even for righteousness if he would have stayed to sugar his unpalatable truth with fiction. I do not think so, though I do not think that in fiction he has any peer or even any rival, because from the beginning he "took truth for his sole hero," and would have no other in any extremity,

or for any end. But even with his devotion to reality in the study of life, which, so far as I can note, was absolute, the prime affair was to captivate the reader, to lead his fancy, not to convince and persuade his reason. A great gulf, never to be bridged, divides the ethical and the æsthetical intention, though,—

“Beauty is truth, truth beauty,”—

and though when the æsthetic intention presently becomes unconscious, and the creation of the truly beautiful may make for righteousness, still it is latent, still it serves two masters with the effect declared of old. But when once the call of Religion came to Tolstoy it came so powerfully, so loudly, that it must shut from his senses every voice that called before; there he stood; so help him God, he could no other than obey it, and it alone, testifying for it with all his heart and all his soul and all his mind. The moral spectacle is of unsurpassed sublimity, and no riches of fiction is conceivable, fiction even from him, the supreme master, which would console our poverty if we had failed of such books as “My Confession,” “My Religion,” “The Kingdom of God,” “What is Art?” “What is Religion?” “Life,” “What is to be Done?” and the many briefer essays, and occasional appeals to the world in signal events and emergencies against its blindness and cruelty and folly.

Suppose that he had never written these things, or such novels as “Resurrection” and “The Kreutzer Sonata” and “The Death of Ivan Ilyitch” where the purpose of captivating the imagination is renounced from the outset and a terrible story is nakedly told, with no ray of the prettiness or lure to curiosity in which the fictionist clothes his invention, and there is no appeal but to the agonizing conscience, would the world even of literature now be the better? I do not believe it. Before he came to his awakening Tolstoy had done enough for fiction and the art of it, for he had done incomparably more for it than any other master of it. He himself says that “War and Peace” is like Stendhal’s *Chartreuse de Parme* in some of its battle-pieces, and he would not say that if it were not his belief; but Stendhal was to Tolstoy, in the ripeness of his art, as a beginner, and of the effect of some anterior imitator. Above all, he lacked Tolstoy’s abounding and abiding moral sense, which is so one with that qualifying all human experience that in Tolstoy’s work it needs no explicit ap-

plication; it is interwoven there with the tissue of every motive and every action for the reader to feel and own.

Yet it is not enough. The prodigious fascination of the tale is such, its interest is so powerful, its current is so compelling, that the inner purpose and meaning are hidden from some at times, and perceptible only to a few at all times. The escape from the exercise of his power upon the fancy is vital to the wizard himself. If he would become and remain a human being, in obedience to the call that he heard above the applause of his admirers, and the sighs and sobs of the hearts he wrung, he must renounce his world of art, the world he had won and held subject to his spell, and seek only that other world in which he must be as the least of the brethren except in the power to bear and to transmit its heavenly light.

No doubt Tolstoy was qualified and fortified for his ethical work by his æsthetic achievement. But he descended to the labor of teaching from such heights of art in fiction as no man had reached before. From "War and Peace," from "Anna Karenina," he humbled his art to such 'prentice-work as those little fables and allegories and sketches adapted to the understanding of peasants and peasants' children, as he humbled his life to the level of theirs. But he could not keep his charm out of the least of his writings, and he could not remain within the bounds of the narrow duteousness that he had set himself. From time to time he rose out of his self-prescribed limit, and then the whole world had masterpieces from him again: such masterpieces as "The Death of Ivan Ilyitch," as "Master and Man," as "The Kreutzer Sonata," as "Resurrection." He could not put his gift away; his mastery mastered even him; his own power made him its instrument, so that if he had continued directly to exercise his art we might not have had greater effects from it. His will was overruled in the simplification of his literature as in the simplification of his life; he could not make himself one with the lowliest in either. The event was in his literature a compromise as it was in his life, when he sat in a ploughman's dress eating a ploughman's fare at one end of the table, and at the other the world, economic and æsthetic, sat served with costly viands. Midway, the succession of interviewing and reviewing witnesses criticised and censured his hospitality and acclaimed or condemned according to their respective make, while in the hours

saved from his rude toil he continued his sublime work. The event was a compromise or it was a defeat, if you choose to think it so; but it was no more a compromise or a defeat than that of any other human career. Compared with the event of any other career in this time, the career of the greatest warrior, statesman, king, priest or poet, it is a flawless triumph.

Tolstoy's example is of the quality of his precept, which with the will to be all positive is first notable for what is negative in it. To have renounced pride and luxury and idleness, and the vain indulgence of the tastes and passions, but not to have known want or the fear of it, not to have felt cold, hunger, houselessness, friendlessness, is to have done something which for the spectator lacks its corollary in practice, as the proposition of certain truths lacks its corollary in precept. That is, your reason is convinced and your soul is moved by what you are persuaded is right in the one as in the other, while as yet the necessary deduction from either does not enforce itself. Tolstoy says, in summing up the results of his gospel studies, that he "believes in Christ's teachings," and that "happiness on earth is possible only when all men fulfil Christ's teaching," which is "possible, easy and pleasant." "I understand now," he says, "that he alone is above others who humbles himself before others, and makes himself the servant of all. I understand now how those that are great in the sight of men are an abomination to God. . . . Everything that once seemed to me right and important—honor, glory, civilization, wealth, the complications and refinements of life, luxury, rich food, fine clothing, etiquette—has become for me wrong and despicable. Rusticity, obscurity, poverty, austerity, simplicity of surroundings, of food, of clothing, of manners, all have become right and important to me. . . . Now I can no longer give my support to anything that lifts me above, or separates me from, others. I cannot, as I once did, recognize in myself or others titles or ranks or qualities aside from the title or quality of man. . . . I cannot help striving for what will not separate me from others" in knowledge, fame and riches, "but will unite me to the majority of men. . . . I cannot encourage or take part in licentious pastimes, novels, plays, operas, balls and the like, which are so many snares for myself and for others. I cannot favor the celibacy of persons fitted for the marriage relation. . . . I cannot help considering as sacred and absolute the sole and unique

union by which a man is once for all indissolubly bound to the woman with whom he has been united," for this union he deems the sole marriage, whatever it is called. He cannot discriminate between his own country and others, or maintain his rights of property, or obey the authorities against his conscience, or take oaths, or resist evil with violence, or fail to work hard with his hands for his bread and for the subjection of his flesh and its lusts.

The catalogue of what he may not do, and does not believe, is longer than that of the things which he believes and may do; for as I have more than once noted, the variety of evil in this strangely constituted world of ours is far greater than the variety of good; the vices outnumber the virtues two to one. His precept, therefore, is mainly negative, as his practice is mainly negative, and the corollary of the good life is wanting as it is not wanting in the gospel creed, for there is implicated in this the promise of everlasting happiness, of personal, individual happiness such as we long for here all our hungry disappointed lives, but shall elsewhere have our fill of with rest to our souls.

In the Tolstoyan interpretation of the gospel religion this promise is not implicit. What we are to hope for is reunion with the divine source of our being; which may suffice the self-wearied worldling turned peasant, but which is not the simple hope of the peasant born, who has never yet had enough of himself in even those commonest things which constitute the bliss of conscious being, the every-day joys, the delight of beauty, the rapture of repose, even the low content of a full stomach.

"It cannot be that the instincts which are implanted in us and which are in themselves not more vicious than virtuous shall become and forever remain the means of our mortification and disappointment," the reader of Tolstoy says. He feels without impiety that he may not regard ultimate absorption into the source of being as the supreme end of being, and that in so far as he has lived rightly and cleanly he may justly hope for a future life of conscious blessedness. All the more simply and fully does he hope for this if his life on earth has involuntarily been that ideal life of toil, hardship, denial, which Tolstoy sought when he left the world. The reader, even if he is not of that level, but some level nearer the intellectual and social level of the prophet, feels like asking him whether he has not made a mistake in

his premise. He follows him consentingly enough in his "Confession," and he owns tacitly to many, or most, or all of Tolstoy's transgressions, according as he knows himself to have lived selfishly. But at the same time, unless he is of an exceptionally gloomy temperament he is aware of living in a world which at its worst is not hopelessly wicked or unhappy. In the midst of its immoralities he believes that he has known many who were true and kind and chaste, but who had yet no thought of abandoning it to its comforts and conventions and seeking salvation at the plough-tail. "Salvation," he would say, "is indeed there; but it is also here in the midst of the easy-going world in which some things seem almost innocuous even when not innocent." He would say that the moral universe was not governed by logic in its events; that consequences often failed to follow causes, and that there was a divine unreason in the Oversoul which was supreme in the affairs of men. He might say that grapes from thorns and figs from thistles were necessarily no more impossible in the divine economy than the entry of a rich man into the kingdom of heaven. He might say with Tolstoy himself that if it was a question of ideal perfection at which we were to aim, though we knew we could never attain it, then neither were we without this aim, and that far or near was the same if the intent was the same.

In all this I think that the reader would be measurably or entirely wrong; but whether they would be wrong who said they remained in and of the world in the hope and belief that man was to be redeemed socially and not individually, by rescuing Christianity from the church and state to which it was devoted by the first Christian emperor when he conquered in its sign, and by making it the economic and political life, I am not so sure. All this, however, is something aside from the literary inquiry which I proposed to myself in writing about Tolstoy. The excuse for such an excursion is that the literature, especially the critical literature of Tolstoy, is not separable from the religion of Tolstoy, in whom ethics and æsthetics are one. This is apparent in all that he has written, so far as I know it, and there is but little of his writing that I do not know, that I have not felt to the full depth of my being. His literature both in its ethics and æsthetics, or its union of them, was an experience for me somewhat comparable to the old-fashioned religious experience of people converted at

revivals. Things that were dark or dim before were shone upon by a light so clear and strong that I needed no longer grope my way to them. Being and doing had a new meaning and a new motive, and I should be an ingrate unworthy of the help I had if I did not own it, or if I made little of it. The voluntary and involuntary allegiance I had been paying to the truth which is beauty and beyond art, and to an ideal of goodness and loveliness in the commonest and cheapest lives, was here reasoned and exemplified in things beyond refutation or comparison. What I had instinctively known before, I now knew rationally. I need never again look for a theme of fiction; I saw life swarming with themes that filled my imagination and pressed into my hands. I had but to look about me, and there was my drama, comic or tragic, here, yonder and everywhere, with the meaning that could not fail my inquiry.

I first saw his book, "My Religion," in the house of two valued friends who spoke of it bewilderedly, as something very strange, which they could not quite make out. They were far too good to deny its strong appeal, but they were too spiritually humble, with all their reason for intellectual pride, to be quite sure of themselves in its seemingly new and bold postulates, which were, after all, really so old and meek. They showed me at the same time the closely printed volumes of the French version of "War and Peace," for it was long before its translation into English, and they were again apparently baffled, for a novel so vast in scale, and so simple and sincere in the handling of its thronging events and characters, was something almost as alien to modern experience as the absolute truthfulness of "My Religion." The incident was quite forgotten, and seven or eight years passed, in which I had for four or five years "The Cossacks" of Tolstoy on my shelves, unread and almost unlooked at. One day I took it down, wholly oblivious of the Russian author who had bewildered and baffled my friends, and dipped into it. To dip into it was to pass through its mystical depths, but I do not know that I yet received a definite impression of the greatness of a novelist who wrote so unlike other novelists, even other Russian novelists. By that time I had long known nearly all of Tourguénief, and something of his master Pushkin, but Tolstoy was a new name to me, and presently again it was a forgotten name. It was recalled to me by yet another friend, who lent me "Anna

Karenina " with the remark, "It is the old Seventh Commandment business, but it is not treated as the French treat it. You will be interested." The word was poor and pale for the effect of the book with me. The effect was as if I had never read a work of the imagination before. Now for the first time I was acquainted with the work of an imagination which had consecrated itself, as by fasting and prayer, to its creative office and vowed itself to none other service than the service of the truth. Here was nothing blinked or shirked or glossed, nothing hidden or flattered, in the deepest tragedy of civilized life. It was indeed the old Seventh Commandment business, not only not treated as the French treat it, but rightly placed as to the prime fact in its relation to all the other experiences of a sinning and agonizing soul. Nothing was disproportionately insisted upon; the story moved forward as with the steady pace of time, and the capital events in its progress were no more distinguished from the minor events by the author than the hours are distinguished from one another by the mechanism of a clock. It would be hard to say what was most searching in it; one scene, one incident, was as penetrating as another. If I name the moment when Anna defiantly, recklessly declares her love for Vronsky to her husband; or the moment when she steals into his house after she had abandoned it to wreak her mother soul in hopeless tenderness upon their child; or the moment of sleep when she escapes the agony of her guilt in the dream that she has two husbands and is crazily happy in it; or the moment in which she begins to be jealous of Vronsky and to suffer not only the ignominy of her social rejection, but the fear that he will leave her, and yet cannot help tormenting him out of sufferance; or that final moment when she lays herself down before the heavy train, and when its wheels crush over her breast would have saved herself from the death she sought; if I name these moments it is because they recur to me at random and not because I esteem them the effect of greater art than some others. I am not sure that the supreme effect of art in the book is not that moment when the dull, antipathetic Karenin perceives that he cannot forgive with dignity and yet forgives. Such a drama within the soul where the actor is the only spectator is something in its powerfulness beyond any overt action or experience.

It is now long since I read that story, and no doubt if I now

looked into it instance upon instance would start from its page to make me think my remembrance of the particulars of its greatness had served me ill. But I cannot be mistaken as to the greatness of its art as a whole; I recall no flaw in it, and its negative perfection is a truer witness of its art than anything positive could be. The happy story of the Levines in its parallel current with the dark stream of Anna's and Vronsky's tragical love is not to my sense the rift or seam in the perfection which some feel it. Rather it is an effect of the author's full sense of life, in which many diverse fates move parallel and inevitably contrast in the significance, the obviousness, which only a supreme artist can keep from seeming mechanical.

But I wish, in paying my eager homage to Tolstoy as an artist, not to appear only to treat of his art as technique. It is, so far as I know it, and I think I have left none of his fiction unread, always most spiritual; it is so far from seeking beauty, or adorning itself with style, as to be almost bare and plain. His art is from his conscience, and you feel his conscience in it at every moment. This was perhaps only implicit in his earlier work, but in his later work it becomes more and more explicit. He is never false to his reader because he is never false to himself; it would be foolish to suppose that he could not misrepresent or wrongly color a given motive or action in his tale, but you may trust your soul to him in the assurance that he will not.

Since I began to write these pages, I have read his critical study of De Maupassant, and though I cannot say that it has heightened my sense of his æsthetics, I cannot deny that it has clarified my knowledge. In this piece of criticism he tells us how, as he read the tales and novels of that great talent, who, he says, could consider of any piece of life so closely and long and deeply, as to see it in the "light that never was" before, he perceived a very great difference in the author's relations to his subjects and his characters. The subjects were, as we know, nearly always the old Seventh Commandment business, and the characters were the guilty lovers, the more guilty who overcame, and the less guilty who succumbed. In some cases, in some books, De Maupassant hated the evil in the seducers, and portrayed them with truth and conscience; in others he rather liked it and amused himself with their pleasures; in others he attempted to be Greek, as the Greek is supposed to have been, but probably

was not, to regard good and evil with a conscienceless indifference, and in the "creation of beauty" to be immoral, or as we vainly try to call it, unmoral. It is only when he was true to himself, to the sense of right and wrong which is innate in a man with his spiritual birth, that Maupassant is capable of that penetrating and absorbing attention which discovers the new meaning in things, and constitutes him to Tolstoy's mind a "genius."

Apparently from the very beginning of his fiction Tolstoy was capable of this penetrating and absorbing attention. From the beginning, therefore, he had but two questions to ask himself: Is this the fact? and, Have I represented the fact truly? If he had represented the fact truly, as in his conscience and intelligence he had known it really to be, he had treated it ethically and of necessity æsthetically; for as you cannot fail to feel in every piece of his fiction, the perfect æsthetics result from the perfect ethics. I cannot otherwise explain that greatness which I recognize in every page of his where he has not wilfully abdicated his artistry to do the work of the allegorist. Where the artist and the moralist work together for righteousness, there is the true art; for it is the business of the moralist to feel and the business of the artist to portray. Otherwise you have a sermon, or you have a romance, and not the homily in which your own soul is mirrored in that of some fellow man. When he had recognized and appropriated the principle that to see the fact clearly by the inner light, and to show it as he saw it, was his prime office, all other things were added unto Tolstoy. In the presence of his masterpiece, you forget to ask for beauty, for style, for color, for drama; they are there, so far as they are not of naughtiness, in such measure as no other novelist has compassed. Every other novelist, therefore, shrinks and dwindles beside him; behind him, in the same perception, but not the full perception or the constant perception, come Maupassant and Zola and Flaubert, Galdós and Pardo-Bazan, Verga, Bjørnsen, and perhaps Hardy, —yes, certainly, Hardy in "Jude,"—with, of course, Hawthorne from a wholly different air.

I like to call the names of his stories for the pleasure of recalling the pleasure I have had in them; it was oftenest the pleasure-pain which the truth gives; but I cannot call them in the order of my reading or of their relative greatness. I remember as paramount, of course, "War and Peace," and "Anna Kare-

nina"; but only of less scope and not less truth, to my feeling and thinking, were "The Cossacks," "Kostia," "The Death of Ivan Ilyitch," "Two Generations," "Polikushkta," "Master and Man," "The Kreutzer Sonata," "Resurrection," "Scenes of the Siege of Sebastopol," "The Invaders," "The Russian Proprietor." Some of these are scarcely more than short stories, and there are other short stories, mere sketches, such as left the wide and deep impression of masterpieces, alike whether they were large masterpieces or little masterpieces. The equality of their art is wonderful, for it is always the same, through the æsthetics deriving from the ethics with the clear insight and the truthful utterance. For this, I have never, in my profoundest gratitude for it, thought that Tolstoy was to be praised any more than most other artists, his inferiors, were to be blamed for their mechanical obtuseness. The world is full of ugly things made for people who seem to want ugly things; and literature abounds in foolish and futile fiction because the vast majority of readers seem sure to want foolish and futile fiction. Perhaps their systems need it; they might revolt, in their mental infancy, from the food that nourishes the minds of grown men and women. But for art's sake, criticism should recognize the supreme value, the prime quality, of the art which comes purified and strengthened to its office through the devout scrutiny of life and the religious will to tell the truth of it.

If one were called upon to say in a word what Tolstoy and what his art was, one could not do better than to say that they were religious: the man, and the art that was the man. The art was more the man than the man knew. Out of the twelve volumes which represent his activity in the edition before me, nine are works of fiction, that is, works of art, and in the remaining three the artistic nature of the man is recurrently, if not constantly, shaping the religious utterances of his spirit. To enforce this point or that, he supposes a case so vividly that it lives at his touch; he invents a parable; he recalls an incident, an experience which he involuntarily clothes in drama, but so as to show its human reality the more and not to hide or to disqualify it. When he halts wilfully in this natural tendency and holds stubbornly to the business of laying down the law, or the gospel, he repeats himself again and again, both in theme and in phrase; he addresses himself to compelling rather than persuading his reader.

It is then that ceasing to take the natural, the spiritual view of the world and its waywardness, he takes the temperamental view, and in the gloom of his mood gropes for a hopeless reversion to innocence through individual renunciation of society instead of pressing forward to the social redemption which the very ecstasy of error must help effect. The state of mankind is bad, but it is not so bad as he sees it in this temperamental view, for then he sees it within and not without, and though the world is within each of us, it is always a little different in each one from the world in another. Essentially it is the same, its good and its evil are always the same; these divinely established constituents of our being no human difference can change; but from youth to manhood, from manhood to age, the world within changes, so that evil will be more at one time and less at another, or if not that, then more or less pardonable; and good will be more or less virtuous. As for the great world without, which is the sum of all the little worlds within, we judge it temperamentally and provisionally as we do these. We may be sure that, bad as it is, it is not hopelessly a mistake, and with all our mistaking we cannot make it so. It seems to me, though I say this with due submission, that it is not altogether or always the world that Tolstoy sees it in his polemics; it is not intolerably bad. For youth there is abundant joy in it, for manhood there is abundant reward of hard working and right doing, for age there is still comfort and the peace of a life well spent. There is not enough of these things, not nearly enough, to go round, so that much merit misses of them; and there is untold sin and selfishness and misery. But at one time the balance will be on one side and at another time on another; and often it will seem as if the effect were altogether subjective, and there were really nothing of what our senses reported to us.

It is impossible not to believe what Tolstoy in his primarily ethical works tells us is the fact; he shows it, he proves it; he traces the cause, he points the consequences; you cannot refuse your assent. Those books, "My Confession," "My Religion," "Life," "What is to be Done?" and the rest, if you have once read them, may have passed out of your surface memory, and they may have seemed as dead as the hundreds and thousands of other books which you have read; but open one of them and you find it all alive, glowing with the fire in which your irresponsibility

bility was consumed, and the light from which you hid yourself, but which again shines unquenched around you. Undeniably, however, the second effect of the ethical books is not as powerful as the first. They have changed you; never can you look on life as you looked on it before you read them; but it must be that in the nature of it the ethics which are not æstheticized are of less permanent impression than the æsthetics which are ethicized. Very likely few of my readers are such inveterate readers of "War and Peace" as I am, but there must be one or two among them who have read it half a score of times and who yet come to it with an unjaded sense of its beauty and truth. If such a one will take, say, "My Religion" and contrast its effect upon him with the effect of "War and Peace," I think he will own the more lasting power of the fiction. It is not only as a drama incomparably vaster than has filled the imagination before, but as a homily, comprehensive and penetrating beyond any direct sermoning, that it moves and stirs the heart. It is one of Tolstoy's earliest books, but already his ethics were realized if not formulated. He already hated the evil in his characters and loved the good, but with an artistic toleration which was also an ethical tolerance of the evil-doers. It appears fatalistic, but it does not, in its panoramic view of the vast trend of human affairs, ignore the personal responsibility of every actor in the spectacle, great or small: you are made to feel that there was a moment in the history of each when he or she, pressed but not forced by destiny, consciously lent himself or herself to the evil done in them. We behold a multitudinous movement of human beings, each of whom is a strongly defined character in himself and is a type of innumerable like characters. Every passion is portrayed, every affection, every propensity, not because the author wished to include all in his scheme, but because the scheme was so vast that they could not be excluded. It seems superfluous to say that it is a conspect of the Russian world (which in its human side is the world we always know everywhere) as it was affected by the wars of Napoleon's aggression; but no minute fact of any personal situation escapes the vigil of this prodigious study of life. If the proportions of the scheme are vast, the density of the constituent incidents, in which there are always free motive and purpose, is not less astonishing. It is as if the story were built upon the divination of atomic activity in the moral as in the material

universe where stocks and stones are the centres of motion as unceasing, unresting, as blind, as that of the stars in their courses, but not less guided and intended. Where from time to time the author pauses and tries to tell why the things happened that he makes us see happening, neither he nor we are the wiser for his exegesis. What we do seem to be the wiser for is a toleration for the actors, not the actions, of the drama commensurate with the scene of the drama.

This toleration is what stays us and consoles us for the sorrows and sins of people who seem so terribly like ourselves, but for whose evils we are much abler to forgive ourselves than we are for those evils which in his religious books Tolstoy brings home to our own doors. It was inevitable that he should finally do this; it was the logic of what he had already done. For him it was not enough that he should create fiction far beyond his preaching in its appeal; he must tell us what he was doing and leave us to determine what in view of the facts enforced we mean to do.

Probably we mean to do very little, however much we have determined. In the mean time he has given many of his readers a bad conscience, and a bad conscience is the best thing a man can have. It may be the best thing that the world can have. At any rate, it can never be the same world it was before Tolstoy lived in it. Worse it may be, in mere shame and despair, or better in mere shame, but not imaginably the same. Such men do not die for all time. To the end of time they have their recurring palingenesis.

W. D. HOWELLS.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND WEST POINT.

BY AUGUSTUS D. SMALL, HEADMASTER OF THE HIGH SCHOOL, SOUTH
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.

A WEST POINT Professor, Colonel Charles W. Larned, U.S.A., in the September NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, maintains, in the title of his article, "The Inefficiency of the Public Schools." The arguments set forth fail to be so startling and iconoclastic as the title promises.

The eminence of the Professor, the already-felt influence of the great REVIEW, and the community of interests between West Point and the Public Schools call for reply. Giving due value to these three factors, we infer and admit that the article is not to be interpreted as purposely destructive criticism. Yet, it has been thus assumed to be by those who denounce the public-school education as bogus and who allege the superiority of some other system of instruction.

The fundamental weakness in the Professor's argument is his point of view. He premises that "the opportunities of testing the efficiency of public-school instruction . . . are exceptionally good . . . at West Point." The reason he gives is, that the "candidates are drawn from every Congressional District . . . and largely from . . . the primary and high schools."

The tenuity of this line of argument is evident to those who are acquainted with the conditions at the public-school end; they also are judges. The fact is well known that West Point does not attract the real representatives of our public schools. The boys by whom their efficiency is to be judged do not, as a rule, seek a military or a naval career. Their ambitions carry them in other directions. The best of them go to college or superior technical or professional schools, or they pursue some industrial vocation. The sphere that distinctly calls for the best will get the

best, and even now wise business men are asking for the graduates of our high or higher schools. Indeed, the qualities which impel a boy to enter the military or naval profession may not, in general, urge him to wide and critical scholarship—just as we find the athletic spirit needing the counterpoise of authority and specific eligibility rules to cause it to keep an equilibrium with the spirit of diligent study.

The writer of this reply has several times taken part in the preliminary examination of candidates for appointment to West Point and Annapolis. He knows the class of pupils who apply. With candor, he must say that the public schools should not be judged by them, nor by those selected thus throughout the whole country. Good, honest, bright boys, confessedly, they would not claim to be typical.

The writer is also connected with a public high school, in which are pupils preparing for many higher institutions. They are each under the advice and care of some teacher, called a "Consultor," who knows the demands of the higher course—preferably a graduate of the institution—and directs the preparatory studies. We show the same consideration for West Point and Annapolis, as for any other institution, by naming a Consultor for them. There are at present and have been, since our organization in 1901, no boys preparing in course for these Academies. We have military drill during the four years of schooling, and the boys take an enthusiastic interest in the drill, competitions and parades; but, in spite of the fears of champions of peace, no martial disposition is thereby developed. Exceptions to this case, if they occur, will be due to native mental bias. Athletics might send more boys to West Point or Annapolis than military drill, and the reputation of each Academy for sports would probably influence the choice between them, surely not decide it.

The Professor's premise has called the writer's attention to the facts related. Another inquiry also must precede the drawing of conclusions. Just who the 314 candidates at his examination were, is matter of greatest importance. It is not to be inferred; it is to be ascertained. Boys might go up who could not have obtained the credentials of the school. We have everywhere the remiss, as well as the diligent. Our doors are open wide; we cannot select the brilliant and dismiss the half-learners, who may trip before the Professor in the tangles of their own

poor ravellings of science. The public schools do the best they can for all. One failure among many successes does not condemn aërial navigation. What of the many times 314 successes in each of the many times 314 public-school systems from whose vicinity 314 went up to West Point?

Another weakness in the Professor's web of impeachment is the importance attached to a single examination, for any purpose. In the best schools, there is no crucial examination; in the best psychology, no sanction for one. Every test is correlated with other records and with daily endeavor. The poorer student may shine, and the better one be eclipsed, by the excitement of one decisive test. Harvard and Radcliffe still require such tests; because out of the abundance of well-prepared candidates, they risk nothing in the method. Many colleges admit upon certification from the preparatory schools, and these colleges, having made careful comparison of college records, affirm that the college standing of students admitted on certificate is higher than that of those admitted by examination. Herein is a suggestion for West Point.

The Professor did not show us his tests. They might be under our condemnation; for the line of thought and teaching has changed greatly within a decade. A few isolated samples merrily given indicate a state of mind rather than the condition of the schools, hasty and partial reading rather than imperfect teaching. The tests may have been better suited to discover what these candidates did not know, than what or how much they did know, of the subjects of examination. Confusion as to places or facts having no personal interest to a boy, or not emphasized by vital connection with other content of the science, may be consistent with a really strong grasp of the subject itself, geography or history. "What knowledge is most worth?" is a question imposed upon the teacher by his various practical limitations. We have paralleled the Professor's amusement over some piece of stupidity, and then been equally surprised at the cleverness shown elsewhere by the same boy. From the questions, we might judge how to evaluate the criticisms presented us. The writer has no intention to apologize for the crudities and errors quoted. Every experienced teacher has made his own collectanea of equally ridiculous blunders and has tried to draw conclusions from them. One inference, however, the Professor's details permit us to deduce. His candidates would be called "seconds" in the market

—that is, they were not the perfect finished product of the public schools. The grammar schools usually cover a period of eight years, sometimes nine; and the high schools, four years, sometimes five. The attendance of the 314 candidates averaged but six years and eight months of the grammar-school period and but three years and three months of the high-school period. Only three of the thirteen humorously described had completed the full periods. Some minds ripen faster, some mature more slowly. From the account, we should place the candidates, especially the thirteen, in the latter class; and they should not have made the recorded short cut to West Point. They needed better preparedness, and probably no teacher from whom they went would have sent them up for examination. Here is another suggestive point.

West Point should correlate with the public-school system above the high-school period. The examination reached down below it. Unless fitted for such an examination—perish the Professor's few months of "cramming"!—geography had not been studied for two or more years. These candidates passed best in geography and history. They failed most in algebra and geometry, the two subjects in which West Point "preps" should be strong. These, moreover, are high-school branches. Two inferences suggest themselves; one, that the candidates had not made successful algebra and geometry courses; the other, that West Point may fairly have rated them strictly in these two subjects. The minimum was 66 per cent. in each branch. One of the oldest secondary schools in the country makes 45 per cent. its pass mark. The rating makes this 45 worth as much as 60 or 70 in some schools. We are not informed as to the method of the West Point marking—whether severe or liberal, whether or not any credit was allowed for a correct part of each question. The examination must go on trial, before the schools of the nation may be condemned by it.

The Professor laments "the physical deficiency of our youth," 30 per cent. of his candidates being physically unfit. Here, he shows again his lack of acquaintance with the common schools at large. He emphatically censures the unsanitary schoolhouses of the country and the exclusive attention to mental development, but points out one Athletic League, originated by General Wingate, which the educational people of the country ought to imitate. Thus, he seems wholly unaware of the

great movement of the past decade or more in physical education. "If education is concerned with mental development alone," he asks, "does the result justify the outlay?" He should know that part of the outlay he cites is spent upon physical training, and that schools and teachers in great numbers, who may not have heard of the League in question, have been engaged in this important part of their work, which includes mental, physical, and moral education. For all that, "100 physically defective" boys might go up, from our whole country, to try for West Point.

The Professor's ideals are undoubtedly quite our own. The writer of this reply would join hands with him in advancing them, and particularly in sending better-prepared boys to West Point. The public schools and West Point and Annapolis are founded upon the same patriotic conviction of the people of this nation that they serve the public welfare, that they are needed by the nation; and there is no doubt that they will be held to their mission. We would deprecate any attempt to belittle West Point, or to show up its inefficiency, even if we were better qualified as a critic than is the Professor. We should only be providing poisoned shafts for the enemies of that important military school. The wish of the writer would be to help West Point, and the only true method would be constructive, and by no means destructive, criticism.

It is the writer's firm conviction that West Point and Annapolis are worthy of the best boys in the land, and that they would have their quota of them if admittance were on a better plan and the life beyond were made more attractive to the stirring, ambitious boy. The curtain has been raised and we do not recognize our best young men entering West Point. We will explain.

Taking our Boston high schools, for obvious reasons, as our example, we state the case. The full period embraces four years, and the diploma is granted then if 76 points are won. A point means generally one hour of prepared work a week, and a course consists of three, four, or five points during the whole year. There are four courses in English and there may be four in any foreign language, except Greek, which is limited to two, and Spanish, to three. History offers four courses; civics, one; algebra, geometry, biology, physics, chemistry, two each; music theory, three; drawing, including arts and crafts, four; and there are commercial branches. A course is won if the pass mark "C" be attained,

usually 60 per cent.; honor standings are "B," 80 per cent., and "A," 90 per cent. A pupil may elect his 76 points, subject always to the approval of the headmaster; and, provided he make 13 points in English, 7 in a foreign language or phonography and typewriting, 3 in history, 4 in mathematics or book-keeping, and 3 in science—and 6 in physical training, 1 in hygiene, and 3 in choral practice—he may receive his diploma on the pass mark in every subject.

Getting a pass mark means serious work. So the great mass of pupils graduating every year are entitled to the recognition that they are graduates, that their minds—as well as bodies and souls—have received a discipline and an uplift that are worth while. Yet, admission to the Boston Normal School in seven out of twelve subjects is possible only to graduates winning honors in those seven, or else after passing examinations in them. Examinations, together with good records, are required in the other five. Massachusetts admits to her Normal Schools, without examination, any high-school graduate winning honors in any or all prescribed subjects. New England colleges admit high-school graduates, from accepted high schools, without examination, upon certification by the headmaster; but certain subjects are essential and it seems to the writer unwise to certify those who are not honor pupils, on the ground that only such, as a rule, can achieve success in collegiate studies.

Now, if West Point and Annapolis would require and obtain what these colleges secure, doubtless matriculation would be more satisfactory. The exhibited condition is that not even the pass mark is required—namely, the diploma, as granted. Those Academies might inform us as to the preparatory courses preferred and supply the literature of their curricula and student life. It might be an inspiration to many of our best boys to prepare and be ready for these Academies. With strong disciplinary instruction there, with required abstinence from tobacco and alcohol, and with a wholesome moral atmosphere, the Academies would seem to the most scrupulous parent desirable institutions. The writer is neither agitator nor promoter. He simply knows that alcohol and tobacco have no place in the best mental and physical activities. Further, he is visionary enough to see in the army post of the future a temperance town, where the ordinary soldier comes under the noble influence of West-Point graduates, with oppor-

tunities for education in the arts and sciences, literature and philosophies, where amusements are extensively athletic and intensively intellectual.

Do we forget that the appointing power rests with Congressmen and that they are supposed to be politicians? Not in the least. We would not change that at all. The representation of districts in our National Academies is a most excellent factor. It is commendable. The Congressman, however, who has the option of sending up a well-qualified boy to whom the Academy doors would freely open, or of sending up a doubtfully prepared one to be examined, would not hesitate long or decide the wrong way many times. The writer speaks advisedly, and he has confidence in the intelligence and statesmanship of our Congressmen, who would prefer to see the district well represented and the appointee winning a position of recognized merit. The plan might happily save him, and save West Point, from his friends. Without doubt, all patriotic citizens would rejoice in the advantage which such a method of appointment would confer upon our favored and honored National Academies.

AUGUSTUS D. SMALL.

THE SOLVENCY OF ELEEMOSYNARY SAVINGS-BANKS.

BY JOHN HARSEN RHOADES.

THE Eleemosynary Savings-banks, many of which exist in the Eastern States, are non-stock institutions. The trustees are paid nothing, the officers alone receiving compensation for their services. It is the general spirit and purpose of the charters of such banks that the depositors are entitled to all the pecuniary benefits arising from the deposits, less reasonable expenses chargeable thereon.

In New York State, particularly, the law covering investments is rigid, and the danger of loss through unfortunate purchases is at a minimum.

It is my purpose, however, to show that under our present savings-bank laws, if investments shrink in value, and remain for an indefinite period on a higher income yield, or if deposits increase too rapidly, there is a grave danger not only to individual banks in New York State, but to the whole Eleemosynary Savings-bank System. I wish to state emphatically that up to October, 1907, no officer nor trustee could be censured—it has taken a panic to open our eyes; but I believe they could be severely criticised if they permit the present state of affairs to continue. I wish to say also that the danger to the depositor at the moment is infinitesimal, for during the next six months deposits are not likely to increase, and bonds are almost certain to rise in value.

To raise the question, Should an eleemosynary savings-bank be kept solvent? would seem absurd to the mind of the average banker; yet, among savings-bank trustees, in New York State at least, there must be a confused idea upon the subject; for the law leaves it to their discretion to maintain a surplus or not. In its application to savings-banks the word “surplus” is mis-

used; in the State of Massachusetts it is called a "guarantee fund," which undoubtedly is a better term. Furthermore, at the last session of the New York Legislature a law was enacted providing, in a manner approved by the Superintendent, for the amortization or gradual extinction of premiums or discounts of securities, and, with its passage, the old law, which compelled banks to appraise their securities at their estimated market value, was abrogated. That the new law was passed by both branches of the Legislature without opposition on the part of the banks would indicate that they either approved of the results attendant upon the change, or else looked upon the law as an emergency measure.

The Superintendent of Banks of the State of New York wisely decided that the correct manner of amortizing securities is at cost; so the banks, as a result, are now compelled by law to report to the Banking Department their surplus, based upon investment value, which, to all intents and purposes, means that they are reporting their surplus based upon the original cost of their securities, and are no longer, except at the discretion of the Superintendent, reporting a surplus based upon the market value.

For the purpose of arriving at the actual income for any six months' period, it cannot be denied that it is an excellent law which compels all savings institutions semi-annually to amortize their bonds by the same method, *but such a law is useless as a means of determining solvency.* The fact that the Superintendent can demand a market report (which, to his credit, he did in July) does not answer the purpose, unless such a report be published and placed before the depositors.

However, it would seem that the law should make it mandatory upon officers and trustees to compute their surplus on the basis of the estimated market value of their securities, that a condition of insolvency may not come upon them unawares and, furthermore, that the law should be so framed that reports based upon market values should be published, so that the people of the State of New York will know whether a bank be solvent, and not leave the question of insolvency, a matter of such vital importance, to the discretionary investigation of the Superintendent.

If we admit that all earnings above necessary expenses belong to the depositors, it goes without saying that trustees are

powerless to prevent insolvency; but it is my purpose to show that such an admission is unwarranted, although made by many to-day.

Cases of insolvency have been known in the past, and, where the bank was small, the trustees were disposed to come to the rescue and make up the deficiency until a state of solvency could be re-established. By this means, in their infancy our gigantic savings-banks of the present day could have been tided over with comparative ease; but, with the great growth in deposits, amounting in some institutions to \$100,000,000, it is now impracticable for trustees to put their hands in their pockets to save an institution from insolvency.

An eleemosynary savings-bank must necessarily be established by philanthropic men. There being no capital paid in, every trustee knows that such a bank should be protected until it reaches the point of independence. If the moral responsibility existed at the beginning, should it not hold good to-day?

For many years the question of solvency had never been discussed by officers and trustees, for the reason that, through the rise in the value of savings-bank securities, for which the banks themselves were responsible—the scope of investment for years being too small—and a general dividend rate of three and one-half per cent., the percentage of surplus on the market value had either been increasing or had remained stationary; but in the last ten years there has been a change so pronounced as to make the following statistics relating to savings-banks in the State of New York pertinent and interesting:

January 1st, 1883—Total Deposits, \$412,147,213; Estimated Market Surplus, \$60,630,827—14.71 per cent.

January 1st, 1885—Total Deposits, \$437,107,501; Estimated Market Surplus, \$68,669,001—16.70 per cent.

January 1st, 1887—Total Deposits, \$482,486,730; Estimated Market Surplus, \$85,633,329—17.74 per cent.

January 1st, 1889—Total Deposits, \$523,677,515; Estimated Market Surplus, \$92,009,091—17.57 per cent.

January 1st, 1891—Total Deposits, \$574,669,972; Estimated Market Surplus, \$89,741,231—15.61 per cent.

January 1st, 1893—Total Deposits, \$629,358,273; Estimated Market Surplus, \$88,752,443—14.10 per cent.

January 1st, 1895—Total Deposits, \$643,873,574; Estimated Market Surplus, \$91,574,734—14.22 per cent.

January 1st, 1897—Total Deposits, \$718,176,888; Estimated Market Surplus, \$93,653,237—13.03 per cent.

January 1st, 1899—Total Deposits, \$816,144,367; Estimated Market Surplus, \$106,896,623—13.09 per cent.

January 1st, 1901—Total Deposits, \$947,129,638; Estimated Market Surplus, \$118,294,674—12.49 per cent.

January 1st, 1903—Total Deposits, \$1,077,383,743; Estimated Market Surplus, \$113,286,775—10.51 per cent.

January 1st, 1905—Total Deposits, \$1,198,583,142; Estimated Market Surplus, \$112,853,766—9.41 per cent.

January 1st, 1907—Total Deposits, \$1,362,035,836; Estimated Market Surplus, \$102,192,265—7.50 per cent.

January 1st, 1908—Total Deposits, \$1,380,399,090; Estimated Market Surplus, \$83,255,275—6.03 per cent.

If the above statistics are carefully studied, it will be seen that, from 1887 down to the present date, there were many years when the market surplus in dollars actually increased, and yet the percentage of market surplus to total deposits was reduced, and it is the percentage of market surplus which is the *indicator*. If the indicator register too high, it signifies that the savings-bank is keeping from the depositor his rightful income; if too low, it signifies that the savings-bank is jeopardizing the principal of the depositor; if it stands below the zero mark, it means insolvency.

On careful analysis we find that the last occasion, when the banks as a whole held so low a market surplus as six per cent., was in the year 1872; but at that time total deposits were only \$267,905,826, while in 1908 they stand at \$1,380,399,090.

The crisis of 1893 was reached in August, and that of 1907 in October. The savings-banks entered the panic of 1893 with a market surplus equivalent to fourteen per cent. of deposits, and the panic of 1907 with but seven and one-half per cent. If deposits increase too rapidly and securities fail to advance sufficiently in value the banks may be forced to enter a future panic with even less, and it is the future, and not the present, that gives cause for anxiety.

When we realize that another change in money rates, sufficient to cause savings-banks securities to sell on a five-per-cent. income basis, would mean a decline of about four and one-half per cent. in the percentage of the market surplus, provided the deposits remain the same, the question of solvency is brought home to us. And, as I have intimated, if such change be coincident with an increase in deposits, that question will face us the more quickly.

Within the ten years from 1896 to 1906 the annual production of gold was more than doubled. To this impressive fact many ascribe the extraordinary rise in prices of commodities, and there are able-minded men to-day who believe in much higher money rates for the future.

If, on January 1st, 1907, every savings-bank in New York State had had a seven-and-one-half-per-cent. market surplus, or in 1908 a six-per-cent. market surplus, this article might not have been written; but it must be remembered that the figures given represent the average. As a matter of fact, on January 1st, 1907, sixty per cent. of the banks had a market surplus of less than seven and one-half per cent., and on January 1st, 1908, fifty-five per cent. had a market surplus of less than six per cent. We may infer that to-day twenty per cent. hold a market surplus of less than five per cent.

It is evident that the shrinkage in the percentage of market surplus has been brought about by two causes—the decline in value of the resources of the banks (owing to a change in money rates), and the great growth in deposits. In regard to the former, it is all very well to assert that savings-banks securities will never sell on a five-per-cent. income basis, for a five-per-cent. basis seems absurd; but the danger lies in the impossibility of forecasting the future. In 1899, the Equitable Life wrote to one hundred and fifty prominent financiers, asking their opinion as to what rate of income high-grade securities would realize during the ensuing twenty years. The answer, to a man, was—from three to three and one-half per cent., and a large number predicted the smaller figure.

As to the growth in deposits, an increase in itself could never throw a bank into insolvency, but it could reduce the percentage of market surplus to such a low point that the slightest decline thereafter in the value of a bank's resources would bring insolvency.

Another potential factor has been operative toward the shrinkage in the percentage of market surplus, namely, the increase in the dividend rate from three and one-half per cent. to four per cent. A general four-per-cent. dividend may have been justified when the percentage of market surplus was seventeen per cent.; but, with a percentage of about seven and one-half per cent. to-day, a four-per-cent. dividend is not justified. Under pres-

ent conditions, however, some officers fear that it is impossible for one savings institution alone, holding a small market surplus, to reduce its rate of interest from four to three and one-half per cent. That small market surplus might have resulted because the institution for years had been most conservative in its investments; consequently, its earning power was less. If these fears are justified, which I doubt, the present state of affairs puts a premium upon risk and a charge upon conservatism.

If it is not necessary to keep a bank solvent, the percentage of the market surplus is immaterial, and the surplus could be figured on investment, par or book value. In many Eastern States, it is computed upon book value, which I believe to be wrong, for the percentage of same to total deposits may not show the true condition of a bank.

If it be necessary to keep a savings-bank solvent, the surplus, if any, *must be based*, at least, upon the market value of the bank's resources.

What is meant by solvency? Solvency means ability to pay one's obligations in full. The statement that it is never necessary to compute market values to guard against insolvency, on the ground that every bank must of necessity be insolvent in the crisis of a panic, is preposterous. We all know that the question of insolvency must be more or less problematical, for we can never be absolutely certain whether a man or an institution be solvent unless we go through the process of liquidation. Nevertheless, we well know that we cannot dispose of our assets, even in a reasonable length of time, above their market value, and so it has been customary from time immemorial for financial institutions, generally at six months' periods, to value their resources at the market, in order to learn not only whether they be solvent, but an equally important fact whether their surplus be sufficient to insure solvency during the ensuing six months.

No sharp line of demarcation can be drawn between solvency and insolvency, and at times the trustees of an institution may conscientiously differ as to whether their institution be solvent or not; but on the financial seas insolvency represents the rocks, and the ships carrying the savings of the masses should give them a wide berth.

Bearing in mind that the eleemosynary savings-bank is a non-stock institution, and that all profits accrue to the benefit of the

depositors, there are trustees who go so far as to say that the law having designated the securities in which they may invest, and they having made the investments in accordance with the law, they cannot be held responsible if the investments decline in value. In other words, they look upon themselves as the personal representatives of the depositors, for whom they are investing their funds. It is just here that I believe the error is made, for they are not acting as individuals, but as part of a system.

Permit me to illustrate: suppose a savings-bank officer, acting in the capacity of an individual, invests \$2,000 for A and B; and suppose the officer purchases two \$1,000 three-and-one-half-per-cent. bonds at par. Let us assume that several years later the bonds are selling in the open market at ninety. We shall assume also that the officer has turned over to A and B three and one-half per cent. interest in the mean time. Now, A calls and asks for his money. The officer will naturally say to him that he can give him the bond, or that he can sell the bond at ninety and give him \$900. A decides to take the cash. B appears later, and if he demands his money the savings-bank officer will sell his bond at the then current market and give him the proceeds.

Let us take a similar case, only assuming that the savings-bank officer is acting now in the capacity of an officer of a savings-bank, and not as an individual, and we shall consider A and B as depositors of the bank, and, to better illustrate the point, we shall suggest that they are the only depositors. The savings-bank officer, in a similar manner, invests the \$2,000 in two \$1,000 three-and-one-half-per-cent. bonds at par. Several years later, as in the previous case, the bonds are worth ninety. In this instance the officer does not turn over the full three-and-one-half-per-cent. income, for he must reserve something to pay the expenses of the bank. A calls for his money. What amount of money does the savings-bank officer give him? He gives him \$1,000. B calls later and asks for his money. What is there left for B? About \$800. Can any one say that this is just to B? Yet this is exactly what a savings-bank would be forced to do if it did not keep itself in a state of solvency. The trustees may not be responsible for a decline in bonds, but they could be held responsible if they permitted a condition of insolvency to continue, for no court in the land would allow certain depositors to be paid in full to the possible detriment of others.

Hence a savings-bank differs from the individual who invests money for another, in that it has a privileged obligation to keep from its depositors sufficient funds out of earnings to build up and maintain an adequate market surplus, or rather a guarantee fund. The absolute security of the principal sum should be first guaranteed beyond doubt before an increase of distribution should be tolerated, for the savings-bank depositor, besides drawing interest on his deposit, is vitally interested in the ability of the bank to return to him on demand the principal sum of money on which interest has been paid. And the trustee—has he not the right to protect his own responsibilities?

It is this privileged obligation which the banks have taken upon themselves, sustained by law, which has enabled them to build up the Eleemosynary Savings-bank System. However, the privilege should not be abused by maintaining a surplus unnecessarily large, nor one inadequately small. Savings-banks never have paid to depositors more than the principal the depositors originally placed in their care. Nor do any ever want to be in a position where they would be obliged to pay less; and, if many were in such a position, it would mean the downfall of our Eleemosynary Savings-bank System.

Over fifty per cent. of the depositors of our banks believe that the cash is in the vaults, and one hundred per cent. believe that their principal is intact, payable on demand, except in crises, when they may be forced to wait not more than sixty days.

It would appear that the system in New York State has one serious defect—that the banks have never been compelled by law to build up and maintain a minimum surplus. We have a maximum, but no minimum.

In determining the maximum, which is fifteen per cent. of deposits, the law directs that the surplus shall be computed by valuing bonds above par, at par and below par at the market. Without doubt this is an excellent way to determine a surplus, for, although at times it does not give the actual amount, it prevents the surplus from being enlarged through an abnormal rise in bonds. It is self-evident that this process is a hardship to a bank which holds a large amount of premium bonds, yet it must be borne in mind that to mark up the percentage of market surplus by a rise in bonds is to credit the depositors with profits before they are earned.

It would be difficult, without doing an injustice to some banks, to frame a law which will compel us to build up and maintain a fixed minimum, for, while one bank could afford to put aside five per cent. of its gross earnings for a given six months' period, and continue to pay at least three and one-half per cent. interest, another could not afford to lay aside over one-fourth of one per cent. If the majority of the banks were paying three and one-half per cent., it would be a question whether the few banks paying three per cent. could live.

A bank of deposit may reduce or even pass a dividend, yet many deposits will remain, but with an eleemosynary savings-bank there is undoubtedly a limit to the reduction in dividends.

The maintenance of a fixed percentage of minimum surplus is desirable, and it is to be hoped there may be a way to secure it. If it be impracticable to frame such a law, I am of opinion that the desired results could be effected in a reasonable length of time, if the present savings-bank law, forbidding the payment of over five-per-cent. dividends, were modified to compel a uniform rate of not over three and one-half per cent., with the privilege to pay an extra dividend whenever the par and market surplus shall be equal to ten per cent. of deposits. If such a law were enacted, I doubt if more than four banks in New York State could pay an extra dividend to-day, nor, in fact, for many years.

The same result could be obtained through concerted action upon the part of the banks without recourse to law, but such action would not answer the purpose, for it is more than probable that a like state of affairs may recur at a time when concerted action may be too late to save the day. So long, however, as the banks continue to pay almost their entire earnings to depositors, unless there be a large rise in the value of their resources, a large *decrease* in deposits, or both, it will take many years to restore the percentage of market surplus which formerly existed.

When we know how impossible it is for a savings-bank to make money, and how long it takes to build up a surplus, what a pity to allow the adequate percentage of market surplus of the past to be reduced, and what folly to gamble on a rise in bonds to restore it! Assuming that the effect of a rise in bonds is offset by an increase in deposits,—a fair assumption,—it can be demonstrated that it would take ten years for many a large savings-bank, con-

tinuously paying four per cent. dividends, to increase its surplus by three per cent.

There are trustees who feel that, if, as suggested, an attempt were made to pay a uniform rate of three and one-half per cent., serious objection would be raised by depositors. This hardly appears likely when we find that The Philadelphia Saving Fund Society in the year 1907 paid only three and one-half per cent. and actually gained \$645,716.29 in deposits over withdrawals, while in the same year the New York State savings-banks were paying four per cent., and lost \$31,608,897.75. The Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, on January 1st, 1908, had total deposits of \$89,595,955.21, while the total deposits of the New York State savings-banks were \$1,380,399,090. It can readily be seen that the Society for Savings actually gained .0072 per cent., while the New York State savings-banks lost .0022 per cent.

The greatest objection will come not from depositors, nor even from the Legislature, but from those banks which hold a market surplus to-day between five and ten per cent., and which are satisfied that their surplus is adequate to permit a four-per-cent. dividend.

I do not believe for a moment, however, when the situation is put before them, in view of the charitable nature of our banks, and the high character of the men who compose our boards, that the stronger banks would oppose legislation absolutely essential to the welfare of our Savings-bank System.

It would seem appropriate, at this point, to quote the closing remarks of an address made a few years ago by a late President of one of our banks:

"Let us remember that the savings-bank, in its essence, was founded as a means to lessen pauperism and to encourage thrift. Let us not forget that it rests upon foundations built upon philanthropy. No selfishness, no greed, no profit to ourselves, shall be the motto of this great and solemn trust. Our trustees are chosen from those who are willing to serve the public for the public's good, and the well-doing of the charge we have thus assumed is the only reward we can expect or desire. Let us therefore work not for the day, but for the morrow, remembering that what we build we build for the day and the morrow. It is in this spirit and with this aim in view that our work should go on, and unless we do this work unselfishly, we will sow the seeds of distrust among the people, and eventually the system itself will break down."

To return to our subject—without doubt twenty per cent. of our banks have a market surplus of less than five per cent. to-day. The failure of twenty per cent. might mean the failure of our entire system. At the moment there is little danger, for every man believes that a rise in bonds is pending, but the danger lies in the future. Let us not forget that in 1899 one hundred and fifty prominent financiers made a bad guess; prominent financiers may do the same to-day.

The trouble has been that the attention of trustees has been centred upon the increased earning power of their investments, and they have paid dividends accordingly, regardless of the fact that the great growth in deposits and the shrinkage in the value of securities on hand, have each played an important part toward causing an impairment in their percentage of market surplus in many cases of as much as fifty per cent.

I often wonder if savings-bank trustees in general thoroughly appreciate what a very small surplus ten per cent. really is, notwithstanding the high character of our investments, as an insurance against insolvency, especially in the case of a large bank. We have been so anxious to pay over all earnings to our depositors in the form of dividends that we have forgotten the word "insolvency" and what it means. If banks holding a market surplus of seven and one-half per cent., which they believe sufficient, would for a moment recall the panic of October, 1907, and the situation which developed among the trust companies, they might conceive of a similar condition arising among the savings-banks of New York State. Before the recent panic, many strong and conservative trust companies were absolutely indifferent to the welfare of a few sister institutions which were badly managed; but, when the crisis came, those in authority decided, in order to save the situation, that it was imperative to lend assistance to their weak neighbors by loaning millions of dollars at a time when they needed every dollar for themselves. Can any one suppose that a savings-bank, with a market surplus to-day of only seven and one-half per cent. of deposits, could materially aid its neighbor at such a time? In such a contingency, the right to use the sixty-day clause, which is absurdly but a by-law among our savings institutions, could be questioned. The purpose of the sixty-day clause is to give the banks time to sell such securities as they deem expedient, and depositors to recover from unwar-

ranted fright. In a case of insolvency, the fright of the depositor is warranted, and trustees are aware of the fact. Such a state of affairs puts a different complexion upon the situation.

The eleemosynary system, which now obtains, with some changes can be made perfect. And when we realize that the stock savings-bank, unless managed with conspicuous ability, is unsafe, that the postal savings-bank is not adaptable to our form of government and for the present should not be established, what a mistake it will be if we do not use every endeavor to make our eleemosynary system impregnable!

A savings-bank should be impregnable to an increase in deposits and a mere decline in bonds.

The seeming apathy with which many trustees appear to regard the matter of an increased market surplus as important to the great majority of the savings-banks of New York State is amazing. The difficulty is to reach a decision as to the best method to bring about the desired results. I am of opinion that these results can be achieved only through an educational process and free discussion of the problems presented. It is to this end that the above article has been written.

JOHN HARSEN RHOADES.

THE PROBLEM OF THE NAVY PERSONNEL.

BY COMMANDER ROY C. SMITH, U. S. N.

THERE has been much reference during the last few years, in Congress and in the press, to the condition of the navy personnel. No one doubts that the personnel is all right, as far as individuals are concerned; but there seems to be trouble about numbers and arrangement, and especially about the age of the higher officers.

The question of numbers is in the way of settlement by means of the large classes now passing through Annapolis. The other matters are not in so satisfactory a state. The public, perhaps, has not paid much attention to the subject. They may have thought it an agitation on the part of the officers to secure quicker promotion. If this were true, it would not be a matter of serious consequence. But there is more in it. If it were only a question of what officers thought they were entitled to, and if they could bring Congress to their way of thinking, the public would be satisfied, but would not feel called on to take part. It may as well be stated, however, that in what follows the results to officers are left entirely out of consideration. The question goes beyond individuals.

The principal trouble with the personnel at this time is that admirals reach their grade on the average at from sixty to sixty-one years of age and retire by law at sixty-two. But, it may be said, if this is a drawback, why is it not perfectly easy to correct it? Why cannot admirals be promoted as early as may be necessary? It seems simple, but it cannot be done without changing the existing law, in which the present conditions are inherent. Then the law should be changed.

So far, so good; but, on trying to devise a suitable change, complications seem to arise on every side. One serious compli-

cation is that the navy list is at present in an exceedingly abnormal condition, the result of past legislation, in that the various Naval Academy classes composing the list differ in numbers from four to 200. This would not matter if the four were near the top of the list and the variations were regular. But the small classes are near the middle of the list, with large classes at the top and bottom. As a result, nearly all the measures heretofore proposed are complicated, occupying several pages in the wording, are more or less difficult of comprehension, and are open to doubt as to their satisfactory working even though they should be enacted into law. It may be accepted that unless some simple measure shall be devised that can be expressed in a few lines, the working of which shall be perfectly plain, a change will be of doubtful expediency.

The principles of personnel and promotion are in themselves reasonably simple. The only difficulty seems to be the mass of details to be brought into harmony. As simple as the principles are, there are some that have never been recognized in this country. They are in the nature of truisms, and of course must be taken into account sooner or later. It will be the effort of this paper to indicate some of these essential principles, and then to show how a few of the most important may be put into practice.

The problem of the personnel, so far as the line is concerned, may be stated very simply as follows: to devise a means whereby admirals may serve, on the average, more than one or two years on the active list before reaching the age of retirement. From recent official information, the average length of service of admirals in certain foreign navies was as follows: German, six years; British, eight years; Japanese, eleven years; French, fourteen years. In our own navy the average length of service as admiral is about a year and a half.

Future naval wars will be settled by battleship actions in fleets, as was the Russo-Japanese war. Handling a fleet successfully is an art which requires much study, but, above all, practice in manœuvres. An admiral who has to acquire this practice and fight his action all within a period of two years will be at a great disadvantage as against an admiral who may have served ten years in his grade.

To correct this state of affairs in our own navy is really the only problem of the personnel at this moment. If admirals reach their

grade early enough to allow of an adequate length of service in the grade, it is obvious that captains and all other officers of lower grades will likewise reach their grades sufficiently early.

The problem may be solved in a number of ways. In our navy only, of those quoted, it has not been solved at all, at least not to the extent of legislative enactment. The present condition in our service arises very simply and naturally. A certain number of young men enter each year at the bottom and go up step by step, and eventually some of them reach the top. Suppose there are 100 entries each year from the Naval Academy. If the age of graduation is twenty-two and the age of retirement is sixty-two, there will be forty years of service. Each year there is a certain loss in each class, due to casualties, resignations, etc. This has been found by experience to be very close to three per cent. each year in all parts of the list. That is, after a year there will be ninety-seven in the class, after two years ninety-four, and so on; and after forty years there will be thirty. Hence, if thirty admirals only are allowed, and all have entered at the same age, then all the admirals on the list will be in the last year of their service. The result is thus inherent in the system of simple step by step promotion in order of seniority, and cannot be avoided as long as the system is retained.

There have been two general methods advocated for correcting this condition of affairs. One is to select officers for promotion, those selected thus passing a shorter time in the intermediate grades, and reaching flag rank earlier than they otherwise would. This method to be effective is coupled with an age retirement in the various grades. That is, officers not selected, when they become too old for the duties of their grade, are retired. The age varies according to the grade. A captain not selected for promotion might retire at fifty-five, a commander at fifty, and so on. This method is called "selection," or "selection-up."

The other method that has been advocated is to promote to all the grades by age or length of service, without regard to the numbers thus obtained in the various grades, and then to set aside out of the line of promotion as many in each grade as may not be needed for the duties of the grade. The officers thus set aside would receive no further promotion and would not continue to go to sea. They could, however, be given a shore duty, and would have the option of retiring after a certain number of years' total

service. (Any officer in the navy may by present law retire after thirty years' service). This method is called "selection-out," or "elimination."

Either system can be made to work. The arguments *pro* and *con* are somewhat as follows: Selection-up is more like the conditions in civil life, where the ablest men quickly come to the top. There is no reason why bright young officers should serve the full time in the lower grades, but they may be brought quickly to positions of responsibility and command and thus have a longer period of service in the upper grades, where their ability will be productive of the greatest good. The disadvantage is that the older officers in each grade have lost hope and are merely serving their time until they can retire. While a commander at thirty is full of ambition and zeal, those nearing fifty know they can go no higher and are a drag on the rest. So there is no improvement on the average. Then the conditions are not entirely the same as in civil life, owing to the absence of personal freedom in the service. A man is free to make his own position in civil life, but he is not equally free in the service, as he must go where his orders take him. Still, on account of the desirableness of having young men serve long periods in the higher grades, the plan presents many advantages. What the service itself thinks of the plan is not of material consequence; but as a matter of fact, selection-up is usually dreaded for fear that influence and favoritism may count for too much in the selection.

Selection-out, or elimination, has the advantage that the officers in the same grade have all about the same length of service, are of a suitable age for the proper performance of the duties of the grade, and serve long enough in each grade thoroughly to master the duties of the grade. Then the process of selecting out the least efficient in the grade raises the average of those who remain and there are no heartburnings in the active service. Those with a grievance take it with them out of the service. Selection may still be observed in the various grades, but selection of a different order—that is, selection for duty and command. Though the young men of each grade are not so young as the youngest of those in the former plan, nevertheless the captains and admirals all reach their grades reasonably young and have ample time in the grade to make their service of value. The least efficient suffer about the same by either method, but in selection-

out those who remain keep their same relative place and there are no heartburnings. This method appeals more strongly to the service itself than that of selection-up.

From what has been said earlier in this paper, it is quite clear that some method must be followed to accomplish the object proposed at the outset—that is, to insure that admirals shall be promoted early enough to serve a reasonable time in their grade before retirement. It might be supposed that these methods, by increasing the retired list, would increase also the expense. This would be objectionable, certainly; but, in a case of urgent necessity, expense should not prove an insuperable obstacle. As a matter of fact, however, the expense need not be increased. Though the number of retired officers may be increased, their average pay is decreased, and the total may remain about the same.

Under the present method, practically all officers retire as senior rear-admirals. The cost of the retired list is thus the number retiring multiplied by the number of years of expectation of life multiplied by the retired pay of a senior rear-admiral. By the American mortality tables, the expectation of life at the age of sixty-two is about thirteen years; consequently, for such period, practically all officers retiring for age receive the maximum rate of pay. By the method of elimination, or by that of selection, relatively few officers retire at the maximum rate of pay; a medium number retire as captain or commander, and a relatively large number retire as lieutenant-commander. The average rate of pay is thus very much lower, and the gain may be sufficient to allow for the pay of officers selected out before reaching the age of sixty-two. By a method proposed by the writer, in the "Proceedings of the Naval Institute" for September, 1906, the cost of the retired list is actually reduced.

As has been stated earlier in this article, these questions have been settled in all the principal foreign navies. It will not be uninteresting to state briefly the practice in the English, French, German and Japanese navies.

Promotion in the British Navy in the lower grades is entirely by selection. After reaching the grade of captain, officers retain their relative position with regard to each other and go up step by step entirely by seniority through the grades of rear-admiral, vice-admiral, and admiral, but are selected for the highest grade, admiral of the fleet. (We have no grades higher than rear-ad-

miral. Admiral Dewey has the special rank of Admiral of the Navy, but the grade expires with him.) Admirals of the fleet retire at seventy, admirals and vice-admirals at sixty-five, rear-admirals at sixty, captains at fifty-five, commanders at fifty, lieutenants at forty-five, sub-lieutenants at forty. In addition, if an officer remains unemployed for from three to three and a half years, it becomes necessary for him to go on the retired list. This is the plan usually followed in the case of captains and admirals who may be found unfitted for their duties. The English method is therefore selection-up and retirement for age in each grade or by lack of employment.

The French method is a combination of selection and seniority, but reverses the order, as compared with the English. That is, most of the earlier promotions are by seniority, whereas all the later ones are by selection. Thus, two-thirds of the promotions of ensigns are by seniority and one-third by selection; of lieutenants half by seniority and half by selection; and in the higher grades all by selection. Vice-admirals are retired at sixty-five, rear-admirals at sixty-two, captains at sixty, commanders at fifty-eight, lieutenants at fifty-three.

In the German Navy promotion is by seniority, with elimination of the unfit, or those whose services may no longer be required. There is complaint that the age of the higher officers is too great, due presumably to insufficient elimination.

In the Japanese Navy promotion is exclusively by selection, but in the grade of captain it follows quite closely the order of seniority. Below captain, selection is very free. The retiring ages in the grades are as follows: admirals, sixty-eight; vice-admirals, sixty-five; rear-admirals, fifty-eight; captains, fifty-three; commanders, forty-eight; lieutenant-commanders, forty-five; lieutenants, forty-three; junior lieutenants and ensigns, thirty-eight.

The condition of our navy list at the present time is somewhat peculiar, but not in any way such as to prevent placing it on a perfectly satisfactory basis within a very short time. The peculiarity lies in the fact that the various Naval Academy classes now constituting the list have varied in strength to a remarkable degree. At the head of the list the classes are large, the remains of the old "hump," as it was called—that is, the classes that entered about the time of the Civil War and for a few years thereafter, which classes were abnormally large. Beginning with the

class that entered in 1877, a rule went into effect (legislation of 1882) limiting the appointment of the yearly graduates to a number sufficient only to fill the existing vacancies. Some of the classes of about that time contain at present not over 4 to 10 members. The large majority of the members of these classes were discharged at the time of graduation for lack of vacancies. The result is that all the present middle of the list is made up of abnormally small classes, and there is no really large class until we come to the class that graduated in 1905, which now comprises a hundred-odd members. The present graduating classes are of double strength, numbering about 200 (legislation of 1903, to continue until 1913).

This present condition of the navy list is really the key to any satisfactory solution of the existing problems of promotion. Imagine, for instance, that there have been normal graduating classes of say 100 members, and that as the years have gone by the classes have gradually and uniformly diminished in numbers, from natural causes or by retirement of the least fitted, until it is now found that a suitable adjustment exists between numbers and length of service, and that the higher officers now reach their grades at suitable ages. The actual navy list, as contrasted with such an ideal list, shows entering classes 200 strong, small classes all through the middle of the list for twenty-five years, and large classes again at the top; two "humps" with a "trough" in the middle. The "trough," as has been seen, was formed by the legislation of 1882. The classes composing it were by that act reduced below the possibilities of any plan of elimination or selection that could ever be advocated or desired. Hence, when they get to the top of the list, as they will in ten or twelve years, promotion will be as satisfactory as possible. In the mean time, the old "hump" blocks the way. It is not probable that the new "hump" will ever be troublesome, as it will no more than fill the depleted "trough."

Thus it is seen that, for the present, there is no obstacle to officers reaching flag rank early enough to be of some use while on the active list, save only the remains of the old "hump." The problem, then, is so to dispose of this "hump," or a part of it, as to allow admirals to reach their grade at about fifty-five years of age, instead of at over sixty as at present, the age of retirement being sixty-two. We have thus again reached the state-

ment that was made at the outset. There is evidently one very simple method of solution—that is, to promote all the captains who are over that age, or, what is better, those that have a length of service corresponding to that age on the average. There would evidently result too many admirals. The excess could be allowed to retire voluntarily, and, failing a sufficient number of voluntary applications, the remaining necessary number could be selected out.

It may be pointed out that this measure would result in a positive financial gain to the Government. The main reason is that without such action these officers would nearly all in course of time become senior rear-admirals and retire at the rate of pay of that grade. The gain is in retiring them instead as junior rear-admirals. It may be shown that, taking account of all the circumstances, each such retirement would save the Government about \$20,000. The measure thus has everything to commend it.

The best way to put it into effect would be to enact a law that any captain over fifty-five years of age could, with the approval of the President, retire at any time as a junior rear-admiral. Such a law in conjunction with the present personnel law, which may force a certain number of captains each year to retire as commodores, might be found to be all that was necessary. Any one of such captains would naturally prefer to go voluntarily as a junior rear-admiral, and at his own convenience, rather than to be forced out at the end of the year as a commodore. If, however, at the end of a couple of years the results should not be found entirely satisfactory, then another law promoting all captains with a length of service corresponding to fifty-five years of age on the average, and a forced retirement from the grade of rear-admiral of the excess over the number required, would accomplish the rest.

The above measures will thus clearly bring admirals to their grade reasonably young. Incidentally, the captains and commanders will also be young. This condition will continue during the whole period the “trough” is passing through the upper grades—that is, for about twenty-five years. During the passage of the “trough” there need be neither selection nor elimination, for the classes composing it have already been over-selected out by the legislation of 1882. Nor need the new “hump” give us any uneasiness. It is probable that the natural expansion of the

navy will dispose of it inside of twenty-five years; but, if it does not, it may be treated as it is now proposed to treat the old one.

But there is another matter that is beginning to give trouble now and will become worse year by year. By present law, the numbers in the grades are fixed, and amount to 750 down to and including lieutenants. In addition, there are at present about 670 ensigns and graduated midshipmen. These ensigns and midshipmen are most of them performing the duty of lieutenants. For a number of years to come, midshipmen will be graduating at the rate of about 200 annually—that is, during the time the classes of double strength are passing through the Academy (the last double class enters in 1913). But as we can have only 750 officers down to and including lieutenants, these new graduates will be accumulating all this time in the junior grades, and by 1913 will amount to about 1250. We shall thus have the illogical proportion of nearly two-thirds the whole navy below the rank of lieutenant.

The trouble is that the 750 down to and including lieutenants were based on a total of about 1000. When the total shall have reached 2000 it is clear that the 750 will not be a suitable proportion.

In other words, the junior grades will be filled out of all proportion and the senior grades will still be short. Thus, fixed numbers in the grades are logical only when the total number is fixed. When the total number is varying rapidly, fixed numbers are entirely illogical.

The remedy is, of course, apparent. By making the numbers in the grades percentages of the whole, then, no matter how the total may vary, the proportions will still remain correct. The proper proportions have been worked out a number of times in official reports and other papers. A study of these results seems to show that the following are reasonable percentages for all the grades below that of rear-admiral, including graduated midshipmen, viz: captains, 5 per cent.; commanders, 6 per cent.; lieutenant-commanders, 16 per cent.; lieutenants, 40 per cent.; lower grades, 33 per cent.

The following table shows the navy list below flag rank as it stands to-day, and the prospective list for 1913, with the numbers in the grades as by the present law and as they would be if the above percentages should be adopted.

Rank.	Present Law.		Proposed Law.		
	1908.	1913.	Percentage.	1908.	1913.
Captain	70	70	5	70	98
Commander	112	112	6	84	118
Lieutenant-Commander	200	200	16	224	315
Lieutenant	350	350	40	560	788
Lower grades	668	1238	33	462	651
Total	1400	1970	100	1400	1970

The briefest inspection of the above table shows the benefits that would be derived from such a change. The officers now banking up at the foot of the list would be suitably distributed in all the grades by the new plan, whereas by the present plan there is no attempt whatever at such distribution.

The perfectly simple changes that have been described above would put the personnel on an entirely satisfactory basis for the next few years. After 1913, however, the present law of entry of midshipmen will have expired, and there will have to be some measure to regulate the admissions in accordance with the needs of the service. This is fortunately as simple as the rest. The purpose of the personnel is to officer the ships. The number of serviceable ships is always a known quantity, and the number of officers needed will bear a certain relation to the number and size of ships. This relation has been worked out in official reports at various times. It may be expressed in the number of officers required per thousand tons of shipping. Considering our own needs and foreign practice, it may be shown that three officers (including midshipmen at the Naval Academy) per thousand tons of serviceable and authorized shipping is a reasonable and moderate ratio.

In this country the fact that such a relation exists has never been given its full importance. Navies are usually estimated in numbers of ships of the various types, armies in numbers of regiments. In appropriating for ships it is very easy to overlook the necessity for officers and men to man them; but in appropriating for regiments, it is the officers and men themselves that constitute the regiments, and it is they that are provided for. A steamship line in acquiring new ships would naturally and necessarily provide for additional officers and men to man them. This practice has never obtained with regard to the navy. Owing to its continuous oversight, it was found, some six years ago, that, while the new navy had been building, no provision had been made for

additional officers, and as a result the personnel was short by a number equivalent to 100 per cent. of itself. An article by the writer in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for September, 1902, entitled "The Navy's Greatest Need," showed this condition very fully. At the next session of Congress, *post hoc*, but not *ergo propter hoc*, the condition was remedied in a measure by doubling the appointments to the Naval Academy for a subsequent period of ten years. At the end of this period, the total will be very close to full strength at the ratio above stated—that is, three officers and midshipmen to every thousand tons of shipping. By enacting a law at such time that future admissions to the Naval Academy shall be regulated in a manner to preserve this ratio, there would be no further trouble as to adequate numbers. This change could be made very readily. The present method of appointment is that the President and each Senator and Representative may maintain a certain number of appointees at the Academy. Under the proposed method they would make appointments in regular rotation to the extent each year that should be found necessary.

At this point it will perhaps seem tolerably clear that the question of the personnel, which should in reason be perfectly simple, is in reality sufficiently complicated. The complications, however, are in the details and not in the principles. If by a few simple and fundamental measures the principles can be satisfactorily complied with, the details may then be left to themselves. The measures thus recommended are:

1. A temporary one; allow captains over fifty-five years of age to retire at any time as junior rear-admirals (at an average saving to the Government of \$20,000 for each retirement);
2. After a couple of years, promote all captains with service corresponding to an average age of fifty-five years to the grade of rear-admiral, and should there be an excess of rear-admirals, select out such excess from the whole grade;
3. Immediate and urgent; arrange all the officers on the list below flag rank in a percentage of the whole for each grade instead of in fixed numbers as at present, which present method allows the new graduates to bank up at the bottom;
4. As early as practicable, but at all events before 1913, when the present law of appointment of midshipmen will expire, arrange that appointments to the Naval Academy shall be made in

order of rotation of the various nominating authorities and in such numbers each year as will maintain the total strength of the personnel in a fixed ratio to the amount of shipping.

In the course of a generation, it may be necessary to devise a measure of a similar nature to some of the above to regulate the new "hump"; but this is not certain, nor indeed probable.

The measures thus advocated are all of great simplicity, a matter of much importance in legislation. Their adoption, so far as can be now foreseen, would put the navy personnel on an entirely satisfactory basis for practically all time.

One matter has not been considered—the question of vice-admirals and admirals. It is difficult to understand why our navy alone has no vice-admirals or admirals. It cannot be the expense, for that is insignificant compared with the cost of the navy. It does not seem in accordance with military principles that the commander-in-chief of a fleet, with possibly six rear-admirals under his command, should have the same rank as they. Then, too, it is derogatory to the dignity of the country that our naval representative, in his official intercourse with other nationalities, perhaps in joint operations, no matter what the importance of his command, should always be outranked by a foreign admiral. Our fleet in its present cruise around the world, commanded by a rear-admiral, has by its impressiveness often caused that commander to be received in courtesy with the salutes and honors of a higher rank, and to be given a precedence which in joint operations would not have been his. This condition, which has so little to commend it, may well be corrected.

ROY C. SMITH.

THE CONGO QUESTION AND THE "BELGIAN SOLUTION"

BY JOHN DANIELS, CORRESPONDING SECRETARY OF THE CONGO REFORM ASSOCIATION.

ON August 20th, the Belgian Chamber of Deputies voted to annex the Congo Free State to Belgium as a colony. On September 9th, the Belgian Senate followed suit. The double-monarch, Leopold, King-Sovereign of the Independent State of the Congo and King of the Belgians, has, in both capacities, set his official seal to this legislative action by consenting finally to give away the Congo with one hand and receive it back with the other. Thus, after years of public agitation and governmental negotiation, the so-called "Belgian Solution" is proposed as an answer to the Congo Question; proposed, but as yet not finally and authoritatively accepted, for, though Belgium and the Free State are the immediate bargainers, the transaction contemplated is one in which the fourteen Powers signatory of the Acts of Berlin and Brussels have in fact the last word if they choose to say it.

The Congo Question has forced itself upon the world in two chronological stages—the first stage concerning a fact, the second a remedy.

The question of fact arose in the middle nineties, as a consequence, on the one hand, of the reports of travellers, missionaries and Government officials to the effect that the most inhuman cruelty and butchery were being practised upon the natives of the Congo Free State, in central Africa; and, on the other hand, of the out-and-out denials of Leopold and his agents. Between the accusations and the denials, the public was at first puzzled and sceptical. But from 1895 onward the charges came in with such increasing frequency and from such an ever-greater variety of trustworthy sources as finally to compel belief, and the "Congo

atrocities" became stock for common conversation. These atrocities, related in detail by those who had witnessed them, and given added vividness by actual photographs from the scene, made such an indelible impression on the popular imagination that to this day many people, of the class whose knowledge of events is gained from newspaper headlines, vaguely identify them with the entire Congo Question.

But, even at the outset, it was perceived by those who looked deeper that such specific outrages were only accompanying symptoms of an underlying disease to which the whole system of administration in the Congo had fallen victim. This disease was not at once fully diagnosed, but very soon it became clear that at the core it was a case of "rubber" and "profits." Nearly all the accounts of atrocities made the attempts of the officials to force the natives to bring them more rubber for export the root of the trouble. As early as 1895, so well-qualified an observer as Mr. E. J. Glave, the explorer, wrote, after an extended journey over the State, that the basic cause of the prevailing wretched conditions seemed to him to be the "frantic efforts to secure a revenue." His insight was increasingly confirmed as time went on, and as the mass of evidence which accumulated month by month and year by year was analyzed, there gradually arose a public demand throughout the Western world, but most vigorously in England and the United States, in which countries Congo Reform Associations were organized in 1904, for an impartial and authoritative investigation of affairs in the Free State. The essential issue had ceased to be one of "atrocities" and had become one of the fundamental system of Congo administration.

And in November, 1905, approximately ten years after the accounts of misgovernment began to circulate, that issue was disposed of once and for all by the publication of the Report of the Congo Commission of Inquiry. The appointment of this Commission in July, 1904, had been forced upon Leopold by the increasing manifestation of public indignation, and by urgent representations from the British Government. Its three distinguished members, Edmond Jansens, Giacomo Nisco and E. de Schumacher, spent four and a half months in the Congo, holding hearings and taking testimony in different localities. As, after their return to Europe, month succeeded month and the

findings were not announced, the public began to surmise that a crushing verdict of guilty had been brought in. And so it proved when at last, after eight months' delay, the Report was published. Its damning effect would be hard to exaggerate. Not only did it substantiate the gravest of the charges which had been made, but it went further, and reduced these various charges to their common denominator, so to speak, in an underlying Congo "system" of merciless commercial exploitation of the natives. In a word, it proved that Leopold had established not a State, in any true sense, but a gigantic trading company, with all other considerations subordinated to profits. This Report has been the Gibraltar on which the Congo Reform Movement, now grown to such proportions, has rested firmly, needing no additional foundation. Leopold and his agents have, it is true, continued to reiterate denials, and in uninformed quarters have gained some credence; but, in the light of the decisive evidence at hand, these denials are ridiculous. The conclusive character of the Report has not been more impressively put than by one of Leopold's most distinguished Belgian subjects, Professor Félicien Cattier of the University of Brussels, who is probably the leading authority to-day on matters of Congo administration. In the preface to his recent book, "A Study of the Situation in the Congo Free State," Professor Cattier said:

"The publication of the Report of the Commission of Inquiry transformed, as if by a stroke from a magic wand, the nature of the Congo Question and the direction of the discussions to which it gave rise. For a heated dispute as to the existence of abuses, it has substituted a calmer consideration of the necessary remedies."

Since the autumn of 1905, therefore, the Congo Question has been in its second and present stage, in which the vital issue has been not the facts, but the remedial action to be taken in view of the facts.

Four possible remedies have presented themselves: the institution of thorough reforms by Leopold himself; the taking over of the Congo as a colony by Belgium; some form of international administration; partition among the Powers holding contiguous territory in Africa.

Inasmuch as the Commission's Report had proved that Leopold had torn to tatters the Berlin and Brussels Acts provid-

ing for "the protection of the natives and the amelioration of their moral and material conditions," it may well be urged that the only right course open to the Powers was immediate intervention to enforce respect for the humanitarian guarantees of these Acts. The failure of the Powers to take such immediate action can only be interpreted as equivalent to a declaration to Leopold that first he would be allowed the opportunity to set matters aright himself. He might have saved his Congo throne by at once putting into operation the fundamental changes recommended by the Commission. Instead, he appointed a Committee to study the Commission's Report. The report of this Committee has not been published, but in June, 1906, Leopold issued a list of decrees which, he made it clear, was his ultimatum so far as reforms were concerned. At the time, the press and public regarded these decrees, even should they be enforced, as merely superficial and palliative, and not reaching deep enough to affect the Congo "system." And now comes conclusive evidence that the public was right, in the official report sent to the State Department last November by our late Consul-General in the Free State, Mr. James A. Smith. Said Mr. Smith, seventeen months after Leopold's decrees were proclaimed:

"That the obligations of the Congo Government toward the natives, as provided for in the Berlin Act, 'to care for the improvement of the conditions of their moral and material well-being,' are being openly violated there is not the shadow of a doubt. The present conditions are those existing under the operations of the so-called reform decrees, promulgated as a result of the report of the King's commission of inquiry of 1904. If they are an improvement over former conditions, it is natural to ask what those former conditions must have been. The remark of a State official, made in my presence, 'My business is rubber,' tersely expresses the attitude of the entire administration toward the native. The latter, so long as the present system is allowed to continue, can expect nothing from an administration whose desire for gain overshadows everything else and causes it to forget the obligations it has assumed toward him. Briefly, the tendency of this system is to brutalize rather than civilize—to force the native into such a condition of poverty and degradation that his future is a hopeless one, and to keep him there."

Such unquestionable testimony as this has been accepted by the two Powers who have most bestirred themselves in the case, the United States and Great Britain, as final proof of the necessity of interventionary action. In an official communication sent to the Belgian Government last April, Secretary of State Root

said, in *diplomatically restrained language*, but of sufficiently definite import, "The present situation is not that which was contemplated or foreseen when the Free State was called to life by the Powers." And Sir Edward Grey, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, declared in the course of a debate on the Congo Question in the House of Commons last February that, "The present existing authority [*i.e.*, in the Congo] is perfectly hopeless," and that, "If you review the history of the hopes and aspirations with which consent was given to the founding of the Free State, you cannot but come to the conclusion that the State, as it exists to-day, has morally forfeited every right to international recognition." There is no room for doubt, therefore, that the situation in the Congo remains to-day essentially as it was described by the Commission of Inquiry, and that the first remedy proposed for the abuses, namely, the institution of reforms by Leopold himself, must be dismissed as having proved utterly impossible.

The remedy of next resort is the taking over of the Congo as a colony by Belgium. This way out of the difficulty has come to be known as the "Belgian Solution." Though it was not as King of Belgium or in behalf of Belgium, but in a strictly individual capacity, that Leopold ingeniously established himself in central Africa and subsequently obtained recognition from the Powers as ruler of the vast territory which he dubbed the Congo Free State; yet, from a number of circumstances, Belgium has tacitly been admitted to have a closer relation to the State than any other Power, and even to possess the privilege of annexing and administering it, provided due regard is paid to the Acts of Berlin and Brussels and all other relevant treaties and laws. The single fact that the same person has happened to be King-Sovereign of the Congo and King of Belgium has caused a close sentimental tie to exist between the two countries, which has been made stronger by the preponderant service of Belgians in the Congo army and administration. A more apparently legal bond was created by Leopold's will, executed in 1889, by which he bequeathed the Free State to Belgium. The publication of this document presented a spectacle amazing in the light of twentieth-century constitutional and parliamentary government—the spectacle of one man deeding away, as his goods and chattels, the persons, liberties and property of 15,000,000 people, and a region

nearly 1,000,000 square miles in extent. In 1890, as compensation for a loan, Leopold gave Belgium the option of annexing the Congo before his death. It is in accordance with this option that Belgium is now acting. But a factor in the situation stronger than either sentimental ties or quasi-legal arrangements between Belgium and Leopold has been the disinclination of the Powers to jar the always delicate "balance" by attempting or even discussing any other disposition of the Congo (after it became certain that Leopold could not be allowed to retain it) than its passage to diminutive Belgium, itself a "neutral" State, created by the Powers in 1830 from scraps of territory which had been battered back and forth in sorry style between Frank, Spaniard and Teuton since the Middle Ages.

For these reasons the "Belgian Solution" has been regarded with most favor as a remedy for the ills with which the Congo is sorely afflicted. It is toward the application of this remedy, in genuine and thorough form, that the British Government has been working for several years, and our own Administration since the winter of 1906-7, when it became publicly known through the press that Secretary Root had reconsidered his opinion, as expressed in a letter to Representative Denby, of Michigan, in March, 1906, that the United States had no rights of intervention in the case on account of not being a signatory of the Act of Berlin of 1885, and had taken the position that powers of intervention essentially as complete were accorded by articles 2 and 5 of the Act of Brussels of 1890, to which the United States is a party, guaranteeing the protection and development of the Congo natives. But in exerting their influence to secure a transfer of the Congo to Belgium, both Mr. Root and Sir Edward Grey have made it clear that such a transfer, to be recognized, must involve a fundamental reform of existing conditions in the Free State. Sir Edward Grey said in the House of Commons debate already referred to: "We agree that it must be a condition precedent to any transfer of the Congo to another authority, that that authority should take it over on terms which will place it in a position to give assurances, and to guarantee that those assurances shall be carried out, and the treaty obligations of the Congo would be fulfilled." The attitude of our own Administration is known to be equally rigorous. The vital query, then, as affecting the final acceptance of the articles of transfer

which have, on August 20th and September 9th, been favorably voted on by the Belgian Legislature, is: Do the proposed terms of annexation and the provisions for the future administration of the Congo, and the past, present and future circumstances which closely affect the transaction, guarantee the necessary reforms?

According the fullest reasonable interpretation to the clauses of the three articles of transfer voted by the Belgian Legislature—namely, the Treaty of Annexation, the Additional Treaty and the Colonial Charter—and the fullest reasonable charity to the intentions of Belgium, as expressed particularly in her Government's replies to the recent American and British communications, the reply that must be given to this query is an unequivocal "No."

It has been shown, particularly by quotations from the report of the American Consul-General and from deliverances by Secretary Root and Sir Edward Grey, that conditions in the Congo to-day remain essentially the same as they were described by the Commission of Inquiry in November, 1905. In view of this authoritatively recognized fact, one single provision of the Colonial Charter, which elaborates the régime that Belgium will institute in the Congo if annexed, is in itself sufficient to condemn the transaction. Article 32 of Chapter VI of this Charter declares that: "The decrees, regulations and other acts now in force in the colony shall still remain in force, except such rulings as are contrary to the present law and as are abrogated." But such existing Congo regulations as are either contrary to the provisions of the proposed Charter or expressly abrogated by it or the other documents in question, are not the fundamentally pernicious ones which are accountable for the worst abuses, and the doing away with which public opinion has so long demanded. Therefore, the conclusion is inevitable that the worst abuses will be perpetuated if Belgian annexation of the Congo on the proposed terms is consummated.

The strict and actual truth of this severe statement of the case will become evident when the Congo system as it operates to-day and the terms of the articles of transfer are analyzed in conjunction.

The Report of the Commission of Inquiry shows that the great underlying iniquities in the Free State are: first, the wholesale

theft by the "State" of all the land except the merest hut-spaces, leaving the natives landless in their own country; second, as a necessary concomitant of the theft of the land, the seizure of all the produce of the land with which the natives might and should engage in legitimate trade for their own betterment, and by the almost total lack of which they are rendered possessionless in their own country; third, the enforcement upon the natives of a so-called tax in labor (that being, as the Congo officials naïvely contend, the only commodity left to the natives with which to pay taxes) which is so enormous, as actually enforced, that it keeps the natives at work for the State almost incessantly, making of them at last slaves in their own country.

The sections of the Commission's Report which describe in details these workings of the Congo system have been often quoted and are easily accessible to the public. Permission has been gained to incorporate in this statement evidence to the same effect from an equally reliable and still more recent source, which is not yet accessible to the public; this evidence being that contained in the official reports to the State Department of Consul-General Slocum, his successor Consul-General Smith, and Vice-Consul-General Memminger. Mr. Smith wrote in his report of last November, referring to the theft of native land: "The ordinance of July 1st, 1885, declared, in part, that the vacant lands were to be regarded as belonging to the State. The vacant lands were considered as all those not actually occupied or under cultivation by the natives; their proprietary rights in and over their own country were ignored." Then going on to speak of the consequent theft of all produce, he said, "The State, in continuation of this policy, has proceeded, under the guise of taxation, to compel the natives to contribute for its benefit, and that of a number of concessionary companies, the natural products of those lands, consisting, for the most part, in rubber, ivory and gum-copal." Finally, passing to the third point, the tax in forced labor, he states that on the basis of an actual experiment he made in having rubber collected under the most favorable conditions, with the native collectors the best that could be selected by one of the State's officials, and the locality one of the richest in rubber, he found that given such conditions the payment of the State's tax would require "nineteen days and five hours each month, or practically two hundred and thirty-six days each year."

This under ideal conditions! With natives less skilful in collecting, and laboring in localities where rubber is less plentiful, it can easily be conceived that the wretched Congolese must work for the State almost every day in the year.

Summing up these conditions, Consul-General Slocum wrote from the Congo in December, 1906: "I have the honor to report that I find the Congo Free State, under the present régime, to be nothing but a vast commercial enterprise for the exploitation of the products of the country, particularly that of ivory and rubber." And Mr. Memminger wrote last November: "In general, the condition of the people in the upper Congo seemed unhappy, and led to the conclusion that the system of government under which the natives must live does not promote their welfare. In its operation, the system seems to be one in which considerations of humanity and benevolence are least important."

Now there is not a clause in the Colonial Charter, the Treaty of Annexation and the Additional Treaty which restores to the natives the land formerly held by them in communal tenure according to native custom; not a clause which puts them in possession of the fruits of the soil; and not a clause which abolishes the labor-tax that now amounts to slavery. Instead is the provision already instanced to the effect that all existing regulations preserve full force of law. It is clear then that so far as these three documents may be relied on, they perpetuate by their omissions all the worst abuses. More than that, they positively specify that the abuses shall be preserved. Article 1 of the Treaty of Annexation provides that Belgium shall respect "the existing foundations in the Congo." This means that the vast areas granted to so-called concessionary companies (estimated by Sir Edward Grey to include three-fifths of the total area of the State) shall continue in the possession of these companies, and that this much land at least, and its produce, will be kept out of the possession of the natives. Article IV of the Additional Treaty provides that immense sums of money shall be paid to King Leopold and his heirs, annually. This means that the natives will have to collect enough additional rubber to make these payments. Finally, the Colonial Charter stipulates that the entire staff of present Congo officials shall be retained—which means that the same men who have under Leopold perpetrated the abuses are under Belgium expected to carry out sweeping reforms.

This indictment is based not on unsubstantiated opinion, but on implicit citation of the actual terms of the three articles of transfer concerned in the proposed passage of the Congo from Leopold to Belgium. These documents are published in full in the reports of the Belgian Parliamentary proceedings. There are many high-sounding phrases dispersed through them, and many vague generalities which look good at first glance. But when all this ornamentation is stripped off, below in its full ugliness will be discerned the same old Congo sore.

If the articles of transfer themselves offer no guarantee of a fundamental amelioration by Belgium of conditions in the Free State, where shall such guarantees be sought? Certainly the contention of the Belgian Government that it does not care to discuss regulations involving the fundamental reforms until the annexation is an accomplished fact seems hardly fair in view of the issues at stake. But even should the Powers be willing to rely on the mere professions of intention of the present Belgian Cabinet—professions not only unbacked by definite laws, to which legal recourse may be had, but professions which need not necessarily be carried out by succeeding and still more sub-Leopoldian Cabinets—they could not find in these simple professions assurances that the demands of civilization would be fulfilled. The Belgian Cabinet, in its replies of April 24th and July 12th to the American and British communications, has said definitely that the concessions are not to be abolished. In answer to the demand that all land rightfully belonging to the natives be restored to them, it is stated that King Leopold's decree of June, 1906, assigning to the natives three times the amount of land previously allowed them, will be enforced. This is an enlightening admission that the decree in question has not yet been enforced, but as an adequate remedial provision it amounts to little; for, inasmuch as the natives now possess only the scantiest hut-spaces, to give them three times as much would net them but a minute fraction of the lands formerly held by them in communal tenure, and over which, Consul-General Smith has reported, "their proprietary rights . . . were ignored." Finally, regarding the question of forced labor, the worst iniquity of all, which under the mildest conditions, Mr. Smith has stated, compels the native to work 265 days a year for the State, the Belgian Government goes only so far as to say that a very gradual reduction will be made.

But why, one may now be impelled to ask, is Belgium so unwilling to undertake the administration of the Congo on terms involving thorough reforms and giving effect to the humane provisions of the Berlin and Brussels Acts? This innocent query strikes down to the very root of the evil. The answer may be given in brief compass. King Leopold has achieved world-wide repute as a promoter and financier of extraordinary ability. The Congo Free State is his supreme business success. The profits yielded by the merciless rubber system to Leopold and his co-partners, in their non-official capacity as chief shareholders in the concessionary companies, are, as is proved even by the published figures, enormous. The Belgians have won fame only as a nation of keen merchants and traders. Leopold's business associates in the Congo investment include many of the foremost citizens of Belgium. Undoubtedly the institution of genuine reforms in the Free State would appreciably diminish the profits from the colony and might even necessitate temporary grants-in-aid. Leopold and his fellow stockholders in the rubber companies are averse to any reduction in their present profits. Leopold's dividend-loving subjects are not only disinclined to be money-out in the Congo bargain, but see in it no contemptible opportunity for increased income. The net result of this hearty accord between the business king and his business people is that Belgium, unforced, will not introduce reforms in the Congo. On the contrary, as the "Catholic Mirror" of Baltimore has pithily expressed it, "It is wholly unlikely that the Belgium administration will spare any efforts to maintain the highly lucrative *status quo*."

This quotation from a weekly paper of Leopold's faith is incidentally important as helping to remove a mistaken impression in certain quarters that American Roman Catholics have aligned themselves solidly in his defence. A complete contradiction of this erroneous notion, and at the same time a fair and concise statement of the Congo Question as it stands at the moment, is afforded by an extract from the October number of one of the leading Roman Catholic organs in the United States, "The Catholic World." After branding Leopold's administration in the Congo as "a most dismal career of misgovernment," it continues:

"Started as a philanthropic attempt, under the auspices of the chief Powers, it soon eventuated into a sordid oppression. It will have served

one good purpose if it affords yet another demonstration of the impotence for good of autocratic methods of government. The Powers who signed the Berlin Treaty, under the provisions of which the Free State was inaugurated, will have to pass upon the annexation before it can be brought into effect, and, if necessary, may require such modifications and securities as may be essential for securing the rights of the natives."

As already pointed out, Secretary Root has taken the position that as a signatory of the Act of Brussels, the United States possesses rights of intervention in the issue essentially as complete as those of the other nations concerned. Will the Powers, but particularly the United States and Great Britain, be satisfied then with the taking over of the Congo by Belgium on the present terms? This query is the key to the situation as it now stands. So far as is publicly known, neither Mr. Root nor Sir Edward Grey has as yet replied to the most recent communication of the Belgian Government, received on July 12th, nor have these statesmen yet spoken in approval or disapproval of the conditions of annexation which the Belgian Legislature has voted. If Sir Edward Grey maintains his position stated in the House of Commons last February, that any authority taking over the Congo must "give assurances" of the introduction of the fundamentally necessary reforms, and "guarantee that those assurances shall be carried out," and if Mr. Root preserves his no less rigorous attitude regarding the issue, then it must be believed that these two Powers at least will refuse to recognize the terms of annexation proposed by Belgium. Such action would either induce Belgium to revise the articles of transfer in compliance with American and British demands, or would compel an international conference. If, even after the deliberations and dispositions of this conference, Belgium should still be unwilling to undertake the administration of the Congo on conditions consistent with humanity, either some form of international control, carrying out the ideal expressed in 1885, when the Free State was founded, or partition among the Powers holding contiguous territory in Africa would have to be adopted as a remedy of last resort. But whatever the final outcome, one thing is certain: The "Congo Free State," and all that this ghastly misnomer has come to mean, must go.

JOHN DANIELS.

THE WEIRD OF SIR LANCELOT.

BY MARY CHILD.

THE writer of the article entitled "Lancelot, Guinevere and Arthur," in a recent number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, waxes indignant with Tennyson for his portrayals of these famous dwellers in the land of chivalry. Her contention with the poet is on account of his eulogy of the marriage tie against the instincts of love. Since Tennyson's own marriage was such an ideal union, there is small wonder at his exaltation of the marriage bond. The true source of resentment against him will be found in the fact that he follows Malory in the perversion of one of the most pathetic of old-world stories.

The hint of spiritual warfare is confused by Malory with the idea of earthly lust. His version of the legend, albeit delightful reading, is of the earth, earthy. He misses the tender sadness in the life of Lancelot as well as in the life of "the perfect Queen," though her sorrow springs from a different source. And the beautiful poems found in the "Idylls" of Tennyson are forever spoilt to the lovers of the twain by reason of his desecration of their shrines.

Perhaps the oldest version extant is the "High History of the Holy Graal," translated by Sebastian Evans. That version gives us the story in a different setting. There is the beautiful picture of the ideal wife, who is sorrowing for her husband (Arthur) in case he is losing his prowess.

"Queen Guenievre was so sorrowful thereof that she knew not what counsel to take with herself, nor how she might so deal as to amend matters so God amended them not."

On one Ascension day, the King finds her in tears because she has "great fear lest God hath put him into forgetfulness." He is moved to seek adventure for the glory of God. And as he

rides away with "the bearing of a knight of great pith and hardiment," she asks the lords, "How seemeth you of the king? Seemeth he not a goodly man?"

Such a naïve appeal proves her love. She will have every man praise him. According to one damsel it is partly the Queen's fault that the King has fallen into idleness: "But never again will he move from Cardoil, do what he may, such dread hath the Queen lest any should take him from her."

When Arthur returns to Cardoil, "the Queen and knights make great feast of him and great joy." He shows her his wound "that had been right great and painful." "The King goeth into the chamber and the Queen with him, and doeth the King be apparelled in a robe of cloth of silk all furred of ermine, with coat, surcoat and mantle."

When he tells her of his adventures, she is glad. "'Sir,' saith she, 'right joyous ought you to be that your Saviour hath had you in remembrance. . . . God be praised thereof.'"

"By God's pleasure, the wish and will had come back to him to win honor and to do largesse as most he might."

When the King is obliged to set forth on the Quest, "the Queen herself would he have taken thither but for the mourning she made for her son, whereof none might give her any comfort." Their beloved son, Lohot, had been treacherously murdered by Kay the Seneschal.

In the King's absence, his domains are invaded by Briant of the Isles and Kay the Seneschal. And the Queen dies of grief, fearing that he has been slain, since she can glean no tidings of his whereabouts. She is buried in the church at Avalon, where she has ordered a coffin to be prepared for her beloved husband by her side: "The body of the Queen lieth in the coffin before us, and in the other is the head of her son, until such time as the King shall be ended, to whom God grant long life! But the Queen bade at her death that his body should be set beside her own when he shall end. Hereof have we the letters and her seal in this chapel, and this place made she be builded new on this wise or ever she died."

Shame on the man who cast the first stone at this "best earthly Queen"! There is neither whisper nor hint of desire concerning Lancelot. There is no talk like that of the garrulous little maid of Tennyson concerning a sinful Queen and her guilty mate.

Nay, the hermits and clerks keep sacred watch over the body of their "best earthly Queen": "The best Queen in the world and of most understanding is dead, nor never hereafter shall be none of equal worth."

The hermits commend the unknown knight (Lancelot) for his vigil in the chapel. "Never yet did no knight cry mercy of God so sweetly, nor of His sweet Mother, as did this knight that is in the chapel."

When they beg him to take food and rest and he declines, as he will keep vigil in the chapel, they agree that "the worshipful man is of good life who will keep watch in such manner throughout the night without drink or meat, for all that he seemeth to be right weary." And what of Arthur, the husband, whose "thought is on Queen Guenievre in what place soever he may be, for nought loveth he so well as her"? Instead of the terrible meeting between the sinning and repentant wife and the injured, austere husband of the "Idylls," the "High History" shows how he grieves over her enshrined memory until the end of the story. When he wins her crown in tournament,—the crown which he has given her; when he hears of her death, he is "full sorrowful and draweth on one side." "Of the mourning the King made is there nought to speak, for this sorrow resembleth none other."

He is obliged to continue the Quest, though, as the writer observes, "You may well understand that King Arthur is no whit joyful." After the Quest is fulfilled, he "cometh to the Isle of Avalon, there where the Queen lieth." "But you may well say that the King is no whit joyful when he seeth the coffin where the Queen lieth and that wherein the head of his son lieth. Thereof is his dole renewed, and he saith that this holy place of this holy chapel ought he of right to love better than all other places on earth."

When he reaches Cardoil and is sitting at meat, "he was bent upon thinking rather than on eating." "The King looked round about the table and remembered him of the Queen."

Queen Jandree, a Pagan, demands he should wed her or suffer invasion and conquest of his lands. "'Damsel,' saith the King, 'tell her, moreover, I send her word that never more shall there be Queen in my land save she be of like worth as was Queen Guenievre.'"

After her death, all vigor seems to have departed from him,

and his knights are sent to fight his battles in his stead. Briant of the Isles, who has been taken into favor, poisons his mind against Lancelot. But his only accusation is that Lancelot is aiming at the crown. Lancelot is recalled and imprisoned, but the King is still unhappy. "The King was one day in the hall at Cardoill, right heavy; and he was at one of the windows, and remembered him of the Queen. . . . Lucan the Butler seeth him right heavy and draweth nigh to him quietly. 'Sir,' saith he, 'meseemeth you are without joy.' 'Lucan,' saith the King, '*joy hath been somewhat far from me sithence that the Queen hath been dead.*'"

It seems almost sacrilegious to read Tennyson after such pathetic words as these!

And Lancelot of the Lake? What is the story of his life and the weird which he was to dree?

In the first introduction, he is offering his life to a knight, because a brother of the latter has died in his service: "I will go with you, that so I may reward you of that he hath done for me. He delivered his body to the death for me, and in like manner freely would I fain set mine own in jeopardy for love of you and of him."

He is regarded as one of the three most renowned knights of chivalry. Gawain and Percevale love him as their best-prized friend. A damsel surprises him with his love for Guenievre, and he *blushes* at her words: "You love the Queen Guenievre, the wife of your lord, King Arthur; not so long as this love lieth at your heart may you never behold the Graal." As he lay at the castle that night, he is angry because she has called it disloyal. Lancelot, living in the same atmosphere with the ideal woman, is irresistibly attracted to her. And the love is so great that no other woman may take her place. He has the love of the brave chivalrous man surging at his heart. To such men, love only comes but once. The intensity of the passion is like the strength of their nature. It can never be forgotten. It can never be recalled. Of the other knights, Gawain is her kinsman, and Percevale is above all earthly affection.

Then wherein lies his sin? Those who achieve the Graal must be absolutely pure in thought, word or deed. Though King Arthur is husband and father, he may achieve it because his union is an ideal one.

Whether the love of Lancelot would be regarded as sinful or not in these days, it is regarded as such by the damsel and hermits of the Graal. The history is written in the white light of the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. Lancelot, himself, acquiesces in their conception. He confesseth to the hermit at the Graal Castle, "and saith that of all thereof doth he repent save only one, and the hermit asketh him what it is whereof he is unwilling to repent. 'Sir,' saith Lancelot, 'it seemeth to me the fairest sin and the sweetest that ever I committed.' The hermit rebukes him for calling any sin fair, and Lancelot explains:

"'This sin will I reveal to you with my lips, but of my heart may I never repent me thereof. I love my Lady, which is the Queen, more than aught else that liveth, and albeit one of the best kings on live hath her to wife. The affection seemeth me so good and so high that I cannot let go thereof, for, so rooted is it in my heart that thence may it never more depart, and the best knight-hood that is in me cometh to me only of her affection.'"

The hermit is scandalized, and urges him to put it away from him.

"'Ha, sir,' (sighs) Lancelot, 'she hath in her such beauty and worth and wisdom and courtesy and nobleness that never ought she to be forgotten of any that hath loved her.'"

The hermit concludes he has been guilty of actual sin and blames the Queen. But Lancelot attempts to explain his position.

"God is so sweet and so full of right merciful mildness, as good men bear witness, that He will have pity upon us, for never no treason have I done toward her, nor she toward me."

"The Graal held not aloof for that Lancelot was not one of the three knights of the world of the most renown and mightiest valor, but for his great sin as touching the Queen, whom he loved without repenting him thereof, nor never might he remove his heart therefrom."

The good King Hermit declares, "'And you had had the like desire to see the Graal that you have to see the Queen, the Graal would you have seen.' 'Sir,' saith Lancelot, 'the Queen do I desire to see for the sake of her good intent, her wisdom, courtesy and worth, and so ought every knight to do. For in herself hath she all honorable conditions that a lady may have.'"

And the good King Hermit understanding his position and peril, prays, "God grant you good issue therein, and that you do nought whereof He may visit you with His wrath at the Day

of Judgment." The hint of spiritual strife instead of actual mortal sin is very strongly marked in this passage.

The most important point in the story is this. Neither the King nor his fellow knights have any idea of the trouble at his heart. The unrequited love must be concealed at any cost. When Arthur and Gawain embrace him at parting, "Lancelot would willingly have sent salute to the Queen had he durst, but he would not that the King nor Messire Gawain should *mis-deem* of the love they might carry to their kinswoman."

When he goes to his expected execution, he "mindeth him of the Queen, and crieth God of Mercy and saith, 'Ha, Lady, never shall I see you more! but might I have seen you yet once again before I die, exceeding great comfort had it been to me, and my soul would have departed from me more at ease. But this, that never shall I see you more, as now it seemeth me, troubleth me more than the death whereby behoveth me to die, for die one must when one hath lived enough long. But faithfully do I promise you that my love shall fail you not yet, and never shall it be but my soul shall love you in the other world like as my body hath loved you in this, if thus the soul may love.'"

Possibly succeeding writers have built their misconceptions upon this passage. Yet it looks as if Lancelot clings to the idea that he may still be able to love her in the next world as he has done in this. But the love is all on his side.

When he hears of her death, he is obliged to dissemble his grief. "Lancelot knoweth not what he may do, and saith between his teeth that now hath his joy come to an end and his knighthood is of no avail, for that he hath lost the high Queen, the valiant, that heart and comfort gave him and encouragement to do well. The tears ran down from his comely eyes right amidst his face and through the ventail, and, had he durst make other dole, yet greater would it have been."

The expressions "high Queen" and "encouragement to do well" should surely lift her above earthly stain.

Like the King, he never recovers his joyfulness after her death. Unhappily his comeliness and courtesy attract women. Yet when the maidens woo him in their despair he never gives them a reason for his refusal.

In his journeyings, unwittingly he finds the Chapel of Avalon, and passes the night in vigils. "When Lancelot heareth that it

is the Queen that lieth in the coffin, he is so straitened in his heart and in his speech that never a word may he say. But no semblant of grief durst he make other than such as might not be perceived, and right great comfort to him was it that there was an image of Our Lady at the head of the coffin."

As the hermits have no idea of the state of his heart, they conclude he is keeping vigil before the image.

Though he is so anxious to conceal his love lest people discover it, in later years, unhappily, he has received the blame he dreaded. Instead of blame, pity should be granted to the comely knight of chivalry, who passes through the pages with the canker of hopeless love at his heart. He is so true and honorable that only a damsel of the Graal and the good King Hermit are aware of its existence.

The pictures of the two men nursing their grief are very pathetic. For one of them, it is the story in "Twelfth Night"—but with a difference. Though he is denied the Graal, he does not pine away in solitude. On the contrary, he is ever the champion of the distressed and the avenger of the wronged. For the sake of the King, he fights against fearful odds. He bears him no malice for wrongful imprisonment. "'Sir,' saith Lancelot, 'your amends love I much, and your love more than of any other; but never, please God, will I mis-do you for aught that you may have done to me, for it is well known that I have not been in prison for no treason I have done, nor for no folly, but only for that it was your will. Never will it be reproached me as of shame, and, sith that you have done me nought whereof I may have blame nor reproach, my devoir it is to withhold me from hating you; for you are my lord, and if that you do me ill, without flattery of myself the ill you do me is your own; but, please God, whatsoever you have done me, never shall my aid fail you, rather, everywhere will I set my body in adventure for your love, in like sort as I have done many a time.'"

The calm dignity of this speech is that of an injured friend. It would be an impossibility in the mouth of one who had violated the honor of the King and tarnished his own good name.

"'Lancelot,' saith the King, 'how is it with you?' 'Sir,' saith he, 'it hath been ill with me long time, but, please God, it shall be better hereafter.'"

MARY CHILD.

SOME SALIENT WEAKNESSES OF PROHIBITION IN THE LIGHT OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

BY THE REV. P. GAVAN DUFFY.

THIS is no strenuous attack upon prohibitionists and still less is it a defence of what we term the "liquor interests." The purpose of the writer is simply to inquire, from the standpoint of Christian ethics, into the principles of prohibition.

The great wave of total abstinence which has swept, and is still sweeping, over the English-speaking world, is something that will stand out in history as phenomenal. Not only here in America are its influences seen and felt, so that the distillers and brewers are suggesting among themselves the advisability of setting their house in order, but in England, in addition to the moral wave of self-restraint in the use of intoxicants which has swept the country, radical legislation is threatening more and more an enforced restriction.

The end prohibitionists aim at is an ideal—the hastening of the day when drinking and the countless evils that grow, unquestionably, out of its excess shall be no more. And, with such an ideal before them, it is not surprising that a large proportion of Anglo-Saxon humanity should be warmly enlisted in a movement that claims to make for it.

But, as in the case of many other movements for reform, so with prohibition, there is a danger of much thoughtlessness in its advocates and followers, which, unless squarely faced, may only lead to the rearing of a structure on an utterly insecure foundation. The twentieth century suffers from haste. We want to accomplish great ends in a hurry. It is historically characteristic of the beginning and closing of a century, that the people then living are unduly impressed with the notion that they are essentially the ones on whom the ends of the world have come.

It is, therefore, not surprising that we should find the movements of the age tinged with that undue haste which is always an evil, and especially so because it is rarely seen by the people cotemporary with the times. The jerry-built house, with its manifold defects, is not only distressing but dangerous. Similarly, moral reforms instituted for speedily accomplishing desired ends, without due and careful consideration of everything which they involve, are apt to be distressing and dangerous.

Zealotism of every description is full of perils, chief among them being the tendency to rush to hasty conclusions which facts will not warrant. Thus it invariably produces a strange but familiar blend of truth and error.

One great danger to-day with prohibitionists is the tendency to make their movement synonymous with Christianity and to base their principles confusedly upon what they suppose to be the principles of Christ. They fall into the common error of quoting from a fickle memory without verifying their references. Still another mistake is the manner in which they confound the cardinal virtue of temperance with prohibition, whereas the only relation in which the latter can be looked upon as being in any sense a Christian virtue, is when its exercise is along the lines of religious asceticism in the name of Christ. And even then, as we shall show, it is clearly a matter of expediency rather than a Christian principle.

The evidence for these two statements is to be seen in the tendency to wink at other moral defects in men, provided they are free from the taint of drink, making practically the sum and substance of the Christian Religion to consist mainly in abstinence; and the regarding of the really temperate man as a foe to what prohibitionists inaccurately term temperance.

Looking at the whole matter from the standpoint of Christian ethics, the question that must arise is, Have prohibitionists faced fairly and squarely the attitude of Christ to this vexing problem? And, apparently, the answer must be "No." Indeed, here lies the chief difficulty with prohibitionism—the attitude of Christ is distinctly against it.

There was no tinge of asceticism about our Lord; He came into the world eating and drinking and, because He shared in the actual life of rich and poor in this way, He was termed by many

a wine-bibber. And standing out in direct challenge of the prohibitionist's position is the fact of the miracle at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. For a moment one is almost overwhelmed by the great quantity of wine given on that occasion by Christ. Each of the six stone water-pots might have contained anywhere from ten and a half to twenty-five and a half gallons, and an eminent authority like Edersheim inclines to the larger measure. But, if in either case we multiply by six it is made clear that the Incarnate gave in this, as in all things, abundantly. To assert that only what was actually drawn from the pots became wine is but to trifle with the question and then not to alter in the least the principle involved. And to follow the interpretation of extremists, viz.: that the wine was really unfermented grape juice, is to lose the meaning of the miracle, and to ignore the words of the ruler of the feast, who, when he "had *tasted* the water that was made wine," said, "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now." Unfermented grape juice would scarcely elicit such an exclamation of delighted surprise at this departure from ordinary practice! Further, the inference from his remark is that moderation was not always the rule, even on such occasions as this, and that by the end of a feast guests might have absorbed so much wine that it would be difficult for them to distinguish the good wine from the poorer quality. It is this fact which makes the miracle stand out the more conspicuously—even startlingly.

One, indeed, is particularly struck by the fact that, face to face with the drink problem, Christ said so little bearing upon the subject. Confessedly, it is a difficulty with prohibitionists. From their standpoint it was clearly the seeming duty of our Lord to adopt a directly opposite course and to preach and teach with all His energies against what they understand to be the greatest evil and curse to mankind.

It is only when we cool down from the boiling heat of the zealot to the calm consideration of dispassionate inquiry, that we are conscious of the lessons Christ was practically but silently teaching in the miracle we have been speaking of. First, He clearly recognized that wine was a creature of God and a higher creation than water; secondly, He manifested His unbounded trust in humanity, which, later, even crucifixion could not kill; thirdly,

He tacitly taught that the responsibility for excess rested upon the individual and not upon the thing abused.

And this last reason, perhaps, is the serious point of cleavage between Christ and the prohibitionist—the one placing the responsibility for abuse upon the abuser, and the other shifting it from the abuser to the thing abused.

In other words, Christ taught men self-control, which is but another name for temperance. Men must be masters of themselves, and where they would not be (not because they *could* not be, but because they *thought* they could not be), He issues the prohibitory injunction, "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell." In these words He unwaveringly and unqualifiedly warns men of the eternal consequences of excess, and just as clearly and as unqualifiedly places prohibition on a lower plane than temperance—it is a maimed life, halted, imperfect. Enforced asceticism was an expedient intended to safeguard the weak-willed, and it was justifiable only on the ground and for the reason of gaining eternal salvation.

Here it is worthy of note that the historic Church has consistently maintained this principle. As far back in the early history of Christendom as the Apostolical Canons, we find Canon 51 pronouncing judgment upon Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who, for any other cause than the exercise of the ascetic life, profess an abhorrence for wine as well as flesh meat and marriage. On the ground that such offenders calumniate and blaspheme the workmanship of God in forgetting that He made all things and made them good, the Clergy are to be sentenced to deposition and both clergy and laity offending were to be cast out of the Church. From this it will be seen that, if there is to-day a wide and great gulf between the churches claiming a Catholic heritage (Roman, Anglican and Greek) and the churches of Puritan origin on the question of prohibition, the further we go back the wider the breach becomes.

Next, it must be insisted that, from the standpoint of Christian ethics, temptation is to be met and overcome. This is to be the line of Christian conduct and Christian development; not a concentration of effort in a futile attempt to remove temptation or escape it. It is a spiritual law, as exact as the law of gravitation, that temptation never can or will be removed in this life.

It is conceivable that a man can, and frequently does, become the master of this or that particular temptation, but he remains the master of what has existed, does exist and always will exist.

Therefore, to sweep away every saloon, to close up tight every beer garden, to make the drug-store supply of intoxicants an impossibility, would in no sense remove temptation; for the main force of temptation is *within* the man and not without. It might in some measure, for the weak-willed who have no self-control, be said to diminish temptation, but certainly not to destroy it, for the chief difficulty lies in the uncontrolled appetite. And just so long as the appetite remains the master, the subject will yield again and again; so that, if it were possible to destroy every saloon and distillery and to put an end to all present known intoxicating drinks, the debased appetite, spurred by its craving, would seek till it found some other and, perchance, worse stimulant. (Every clergyman who deals with moral disease is familiar with the person who has been whiskey-cured to become drug-crazed, and with the common type of those who think they have conquered a besetting sin when they have only merely exchanged it for another.)

It is an unfailing law that the existence of appetite connotes that there is food wherewith to satisfy it, and the only question for moralists is the regulation of its lawful use and the prevention of its abuse. Consequently, to place the blame on the thing abused and not upon the abuser, is to evade the whole question. And just so long as the prohibitionist continues to fix the responsibility for the drunkard's downfall upon the drink he abuses, rather than upon the drunkard himself, just so long will he furnish the excuse the abuser is looking for in the evasion of responsibility.

This evasion is as old as Adam. When God called him to account for his sin in the Garden of Eden, he immediately placed the blame upon the woman, and the woman in her turn placed it upon the serpent. But both knew all the time in their guilty hearts that the responsibility could only be laid at their own doors. True, they were tempted, but it was evidently the Divine intention that unfallen man should be tempted. Humanly speaking, temptation is a necessary consequence to man's free-will. The forbidden tree which stood in the garden was always before the eyes of our first parents. In itself it was a temptation, but, so far from being there to harm them, it was, if resisted, to be

a means of development. The sin lay not in the temptation, but in the perversion of the human will which challenged temptation and led to the eating of the fruit.

And just because temptation was and is a necessity for man's development and progress then and now, God still suffers it. The expediency of the prohibitionist in his futile attempt to remove temptation was certainly not God's method, and for this life it never can be.

The only basis of reform, then, is through the individual; the building up of his moral strength and will-power which will result in self-control. This clearly is the work of the Christian Church, and the only solution of the problem. Regulate the saloon by all means; rid it of its debasing conditions, or change the method of supply of intoxicants by abolishing the saloon, if needs be, for governmental control and sale, or some other judicious method—all this may be well and good and wise, but the one essential that must ever be kept in view is to teach men to be masters of their appetites. When this is done, the problem is solved.

If one has a nervous horse that shies at posts and pillars in a town, it is manifestly absurd and impossible to remove each and every obstacle that abounds. This would be no sane education of the animal. The danger lies not in the post the horse shies at, but in the beast itself. Therefore, the wise driver will continue to lead or whip his horse up to the disturbing cause to teach it control.

On the practical side of the present-day prohibitionism there is manifested manifold defects. Men will never be legislated into real morality, and, in pinning so much faith and value to law as a moral reformer, the prohibitionist is evidencing a decided weakness of his system. It is here that haste is so destructive. It has taken nineteen hundred years of Christian teaching to bring mankind to the state of control it has at present. It is foolish in the extreme to suppose that now in a few short years, by acts of legislation, we are going to root out a moral difficulty. It is the haste, the wanting to see results, that is the root of all this. To a large degree it is in its motive commendable, but plainly impossible, if past history is of any value.

As a consequence, we find men acting on impulse, clamoring for legislation which is not truly reflective of the corporate or

community Ego. The ethical value of law lies not in the law itself, but in its reflecting and recording of public thought—so that no law is stronger than public opinion.

So it often follows, even in local-option towns, that men have voted for what they were not inwardly willing to maintain for themselves. The thought has been for the "other fellow," and then, when the restraint their votes had imposed has been felt personally, the tendency is to dissemble—to become a creature of appearances. Hence the display of moral cowardice is nowhere more deplorably in evidence than in prohibition states and local-option towns. The man who wants his liquor gets it surreptitiously from the drug-store, or in the unmarked packages that are shipped by express, or from the pocket peddler. In each case he is apt to drink concoctions which are full of impurities—sometimes vile and health-destroying—or, he has recourse to the more respectable method of buying patent medicines, containing anywhere from ten to seventy-five per cent. of alcohol, with the advantage of feeling free to point the finger of reproach at the open drinker with his bottle of beer containing four per cent. of alcohol! Each year he, perchance, votes "no license" to measure up to the standard of artificiality, and congratulates himself that he can successfully humbug his neighbors when they only *think* they are humbugging him!

As a consequence of all this, the disease is driven *in*, and the danger, as a result, terribly increased. The words of the Bishop of Vermont in a recent sermon in London, in which he warned the English people against acting hastily, by dwelling upon the dangers of the hidden disease of drink in America—the result of prohibition—are words that will be weighed by all except fanatics.

The writer speaks as one who is familiar with the practical results of prohibition in prohibition States in east and west, and as one who has long studied the question. It is clear to his mind, at least, that the weaknesses of that system are manifest in the manner which he has set forth.

Surely it were better to frankly face the whole situation, even at the risk of a shock to religious prejudices or the ideals of well-meaning prohibitionists, than to go on, blind to facts, pursuing the impossible for our time. Moral reforms never come in a hurry, and none that is lasting has come purely as a result

of a legislative act. The seat of moral disease is within the man. And, after all, as we have shown, drunkenness is but the excessive indulgence of an appetite which the example of the world's greatest Reformer shows us has a perfectly legitimate use. To turn back to that cardinal virtue translated into Christianity from Greek Philosophy, and blessed in the Name of Christ, Temperance, it may be confidently believed that self-control offers the wisest course for the general run of humanity. So it becomes the duty of the Christian Church to rescue the name of this virtue, which prohibitionists have perverted into a synonym for total abstinence, and to inculcate it and its powers into men's hearts.

When Christendom ceases to rely upon Cæsar to effect moral reforms and depends alone upon the powers Christ committed to His Church; when she eschews haste and devotes herself to influencing her members to contribute all they can contribute to the work of building up in their contemporaries, as in themselves, moral strength and self-control, in this as in all things, then, and only then, will each successive generation be practically helping to solve the problem that to many seems to defy solution to-day.

We go back to the Master with this vexing question and we find Him standing calmly in the midst of human misery, free from haste and unbounded in His trust in and for humanity and, withal, the only One that offers a solution of all mankind's ills. And it is not to the creatures or gifts of God which men abuse in excessive indulgence that He points, as the cause of human wretchedness and sin, but man's own weaknesses within. The burden of His message is to beware of all that makes only for appearances; to make clean the *inside* of the platter as man's first concern; and pointing to the appalling evidences of men's sin which are all around Him, we hear Him say, "All these evil things come from within and defile the man."

P. GAVAN DUFFY.

THE DAWNING OF A WISER CHINESE POLICY.

BY STEPHEN W. NICKERSON, IMPERIAL CHINESE CONSUL AT BOSTON,
MASSACHUSETTS; COMMERCIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
VICEROY OF CHIHLI; COMMERCIAL AGENT OF THE
VICEROY OF THE TWO KUANG PROVINCES.

WHEN that brilliant diplomat, Sir Chentung Liang-Cheng, K.C.M.G., being about to relinquish his post as Minister for China near the Government of the United States of America, having been called to higher duties at home, visited President Roosevelt late in June of 1907 to thank him on behalf of His Imperial Chinese Majesty for the generosity of the American Government in remitting a great portion of the Chinese indemnity, His Excellency bore the following cable message from the Chinese Foreign Office:

"PEKIN, June 24, 1907.

"Wai-Wu-Pu, to the Chinese Minister:

"Your telegraphic report on the remission of the indemnity having been laid before the Emperor, you are commanded to convey to the President of the United States His Majesty's warm thanks for this noble exhibition of his friendship towards China, which is deeply and greatly appreciated, by having alone taken the lead in a matter of international justice."

Thus closed the late minister's diplomatic service in the United States.

The friends of China hope that the fact above mentioned marks the dawning of a wiser policy on the part of the Government of the United States and of the American people towards the Chinese Empire and its people. This hope is most earnest in the minds of those Americans who have gained a knowledge of that Empire and its people by a sojourn in the Orient. Those Amer-

icans whose knowledge of the Chinese people has been gained only by an observation of the Chinese coolies who work as laundrymen or in some other humble occupation in our country—rustics of the lowest class, country village boys from two or three districts of a province in South China—are not competent to form an opinion of any value about the policy which should be pursued as to China. The writer here disclaims any criticism of these humble Chinese individuals, for he thinks they are equal, if not superior, in most respects to a similar class of immigrants from any other country; and he believes that their custom of wearing a queue is largely the cause of the prejudice against them, for human nature is influenced by trifling things. The industry, thrift and other peaceful virtues of the average Chinaman, coupled with his peculiar garb and unusual appearance, are the real causes of the popular prejudice, rather than the vices of the occasional individual.

But let us state at the outset of this article that we believe in preserving North America for our own race, as we would preserve China for the Chinese—that we think too many Chinamen here would be undesirable, just as too many Americans and other foreigners would be undesirable there. But some of each in the country of the other are beneficial.

To appreciate properly the importance of our Government's present better attitude towards China and the Chinese, we must glance at some of the unfair and unjust official acts of the not remote past on the part of the United States Government, in order to contrast them with the loyal conduct of the Chinese Government and some of its high officials in recent months—to contrast our maladroit past policy with the patient forbearance of our Asiatic friends.

Thus, in the summer of 1882, Attorney-General Brewster decided (17 Op. Att'y Gen., 416) that Chinese laborers, in transit to or from China and some other country, could not lawfully be transported across the United States, and thought his opinion not obnoxious to the imputation of harshness or inhospitality towards a friendly Power. About six months later, this same official retracted his first opinion and came (17 Op. A. G., 483) to a contrary decision. In the spring of 1886, Attorney-General Garland decided (18 Op. A. G., 388) that the first opinion was correct. In the summer of 1889, Attorney-General Miller decided

(19 Op. A. G., 369) that the second opinion was correct. Here we have four conflicting opinions in the short space of seven years, each temporarily controlling the attitude of the United States Government as to the right of an humble Chinese person to cross our country's territory while in transit to or from his native land. Can any one be surprised if such a course of conduct gave rise to conjecture in the minds of high Chinese officials as to whether the American Government was ignorant, trifling or insincere? Not until 1894 was the matter put at rest by Attorney-General Olney (20 Op. A. G., 693). In the mean time, the poor Chinese traveller was in a natural state of bewilderment as to what his rights were.

In this REVIEW for September, 1905, in an article upon our Chinese Treaties, etc., it was pointed out, among other things, by the writer, that Congress had passed numerous acts that bore heavily upon the Chinese; but the Act of October, 1888, by explicitly declaring void and of no effect "return certificates," granted under the Act of 1882 to Chinese laborers, was so glaring a wrong that we here again refer to it. The poor fellows, before they left the United States, were given a paper entitling them to return thereto, and then, while they were absent, the right was taken away, and this without any notice or warning. Could a meaner fraud be practised by a great Government upon humble persons?

Let us now turn to the conduct of the United States Military Government in Cuba, prior to the establishment of the Cuban Republic, and its treatment of the Chinese. In accordance with the provisions of a circular of the Division of Insular Affairs, dated April 14th, 1899, the immigration laws and regulations of the United States were extended to Cuba, and the War Department accordingly promulgated an order, dated June 6th, 1899, giving effect there to certain immigration regulations. The general immigration laws of the United States were referred to in the above-mentioned circular, and to carry them into effect was the purpose of the promulgating order of the War Department, for the regulations published with that order had only that object in view. Moreover, it was expressly stated in the various acts of Congress governing immigration to the United States that their provisions are *not applicable to Chinese* persons. On this account, the customs officers of the United States in Cuba, during the con-

tinuance of the Military Government of the United States in that island, did not enforce the exclusion laws of the United States against the Chinese; and Chinese subjects of all classes, whether new arrivals or old residents, were allowed to go and come of their free will and accord.

But on the 15th of May, 1902—five days before the transfer of authority from the Military Government of the United States to the Constitutional Government of Cuba—General Leonard Wood issued an order purporting to *re-enact* certain provisions of the immigration laws of the United States, which had been in force in Cuba since April 14th, 1899, so as to enable their continued enforcement pending the action of the Cuban Congress on the subject. And it was found that he had incorporated into that order two entirely new sections, which were not in the then existing laws in force in Cuba, expressly prohibiting the admission of Chinese into the island. Thus, by a stroke of the pen and under cover of *re-enactment*, he deprived, without a moment of warning, the Chinese in Cuba of rights which they had long enjoyed, and left them practically without redress. The time was too short for taking an appeal to the United States Government. If he had, three years before, as Military Governor of Cuba, arbitrarily extended the operation of the Chinese exclusion laws to the island of Cuba, he would have acted within his authority in so doing, no matter how hard this might bear upon the Chinese who had occasion to resort to the island. Under such circumstances, they could have had recourse at least to the Government at Washington for relief. But to spring this new legislation upon them under color of “re-enactment” just a few days before his giving up office, was an unjustifiable proceeding.

In consequence of General Wood's order, over forty Chinese who arrived at Havana soon thereafter were not permitted to land. Some of them had been for years residing and doing business in Cuba, and had just returned from a temporary absence in China. It was a great hardship to them not to be able to land after travelling at great expense so long a distance. It must be remembered that they had left China before the issuance of that order. Thus were entailed untold hardships upon the Chinese in Cuba.

It is believed by eminent legal authorities that General Wood's order, in so far as it prohibited the coming of Chinese into Cuba, was legally invalid, because he could not *re-enact* any provisions

of law which never existed in any form. By so doing he exceeded his authority.

In any case, why should Chinese laborers be excluded from Cuba? The labor conditions of Cuba have nothing in common with those of the United States. The Cubans themselves have no objection to Chinese labor. On the contrary, the development of the "Queen of the Antilles" requires labor which cannot be supplied from any other quarter than China. General Wood's order was, therefore, unnecessary.

In this connection the words of President Madison are apposite. He said that the exclusion of an alien from a country where he may have formed the most tender connections; where he has invested his property, and acquired property of the real permanent, as well as of the movable temporary, kind; where he may enjoy under the laws a great share of the blessings of personal security and personal liberty; if a banishment of this sort be not a punishment and among the severest of punishments, it will be difficult to imagine a doom to which the name can be applied.

By the Act of Congress on April 27th, 1904, section 5, that amended and re-enacted the Act of April 29th, 1902, which latter was an act to prohibit the coming into, and to regulate the residence within, the United States, its Territories, and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese and persons of Chinese descent, among other things prevents Chinese immigration into the Philippine Islands—the most unwise piece of legislation concerning the Chinese now on our statute-books. Exactly what good to Americans anywhere, at home or abroad, is accomplished by preventing the Chinese who will work from going into the Philippine Islands whose inhabitants will not work—for the Filipino having much Malay blood seems to be willing to do anything in reason but work—is something impossible to discover. No one gains by this "dog-in-the-manger" policy. Is it not the Chinaman who has made the Straits Settlements? Does not the Chinaman do most of the work, pay most of the taxes, and own most of the property in those settlements? Ask the British, to whom that territory belongs. Ask the ten thousand Britons at Hong-kong what that colony would amount to without its 200,000 Chinese. Why, then, prevent the Chinese from going to the Philippine Islands to develop them, do their work, pay their taxes, and create prop-

erty there worth owning? Perhaps it is thought more statesmanlike to continue to expend revenues, raised by taxation direct and indirect from American citizens at home, upon the Philippine Islands—to continue to burden our citizens at home for the sake of our insular folly abroad.

A subordinate bureau of the United States Government has even sought to control the movements of Chinese subjects while in Canada; for, in the annual report for 1903 of the United States Commissioner-General of Immigration, who is a bureau chief now in the Department of Commerce and Labor, there is printed the text of a contract, dated February 23rd, 1903, between that Commissioner-General and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, whereby it is agreed that the railway shall deliver all the Chinese it may transport across Canada only at certain places within the northern boundary of the United States specified in the contract; and that in every case the specified places shall not be considered for the purposes of the contract as territory of the United States until the right of a Chinaman to enter the United States, who may have been brought to any one of these "holy" places by the railway, has been admitted by the American officials; and that Chinese who may be refused admission to the United States shall be carried back by the railway to the Canadian port whence they came, to be deported to the foreign port of original embarkation in the company's steamships.

Without questioning the efficacy of this contract in respect to its workings, nor in respect to the convenience of some of its provisions, comment upon this extraordinary contract is permissible; and it is not the Chinese officials alone who have questioned the right of a mere bureau of the Washington Government to agree that specified places within the territory of the United States should not be considered territory thereof, no matter for how short a time nor for what purpose. It is permissible also to wonder what may be the reasons why the Canadian Government has allowed a mere railway corporation, one of its common carriers, to usurp its functions by agreeing that the subjects of His Imperial Chinese Majesty, who is at peace with King Edward VII, should be limited by the railway in respect to their freedom of movement under the British flag—always supposing them to be lawfully in the territory over which that flag floats. Diplomats will not be surprised if an intimation from London should warn

the Canadian Government to prevent this and all future encroachments by the railway upon the functions of the British Crown. After such warning, Chinamen who are lawfully in Canada will be able to consult their own wishes and convenience, like people of any other nationality, and leave Canada by steamer from Montreal, for example, instead of being carried back to Vancouver and to China against their wills; or because the railway had previously compelled them to agree that they were to be so carried back, before it would allow them to leave its ships on the Pacific coast. (Let it be remembered that it was the Canadian Government, and not the Canadian Pacific Railway, which prescribed that the number of Chinese brought to Canadian ports shall depend upon the tonnage of the steamers bringing them.) The railway might lose some of the profits unwillingly paid to it, while the Canadian Government would resume its proper functions. The United States Commissioner-General of Immigration would then cease to exercise powers that are *ultra vires*. Bureau and railroads cannot make treaties, and should not make contracts in lieu of treaties. The railway would confine itself strictly to its transportation business, thereafter ceasing to pretend to exercise any of the powers of government in respect to the lawful movements of Chinese subjects.

But let us turn our minds to some proofs of the better and wiser ideas and conduct of the Chinese Government in respect to matters American, in order to contrast them with the official utterances and the Congressional and bureaucratic legislation at which we have just glanced.

The Chinese philosopher Mencius, a contemporary of Plato and Aristotle, based his political economy upon ethics, and his ethics upon the doctrine of man's nature; the ethical problem was for him how to effect the utmost development of all the good elements of man's nature. The problem of the organization of a State with him was, Under what conditions can the highest aims be reached? He believed that the Government should consciously endeavor to bring about these conditions. One of his many wise utterances should rest in our minds: "Clear views as to justice and duty make true men."

It was a clear perception of his duty that caused His Excellency the Viceroy Chou Fu at Canton recently to order the Nam Hoi and Poon Yu magistrates to detain one Mar, then posing

as the leader of the boycott against American goods, which certain agitators sought to revive. The wise and kindly Viceroy was not unaware of the existence of causes for the boycott whose recrudescence then appeared. All the Chinese in the United States were from the portion of China which he governed; and a resentment by no means unjust when seen from a Chinese viewpoint, however it may have seemed from an American viewpoint, inspired the very considerable pecuniary assistance given to the Canton agitators by Chinese in the United States and elsewhere to their fellow countrymen at home. But to permit so unfriendly a thing as a boycott against the goods of the one foreign nation that has never sought to acquire a permanent footing upon the soil of the Empire, was not in harmony with the Viceroy's ideas of duty. He impounded the pecuniary assistance referred to and firmly suppressed the agitation. The illustrious Wu Ting-fang, Minister to the United States, was at the time a guest at the Viceroy's yamen. So far from being willing that commerce should be impeded between the United States and the Chinese territory he controlled, His Excellency the Viceroy took a very unusual step to indicate his wish that commerce should, on the contrary, be fostered and encouraged. The Viceroy called the writer of this article, who was then in South China, to his yamen, and, after giving most positive and explicit instructions, which were repeated by the Viceregal chief secretaries, honored him with the following commission, the existence of which should be a complete refutation of the baseless intimations, emanating at one time from uninformed persons, implying that the boycott movement had official countenance. Let the reader who doubts the loyal attitude of Chinese Government officials to our Government, peruse the following despatch here made public for the first time:

"APPOINTMENT granted to Nickerson by Chou, wearing the brevet red button of the best grade, Viceroy of the Two Kuang provinces, in charge of the duties of Governor of Kuangtung province and Superintendent of the Canton and Taiping Customs.

"Whereas, Chinese sojourning in the United States are mainly composed of natives of Kuangtung province and it seems that trade between the two countries has diminished lately as compared with what it was before, it therefore remains for me to better conditions if possible. I find upon investigation that there is Nickerson, acting on behalf of the Imperial Government as Chinese consul in Boston, who has resided in that city for a long time and is well acquainted with conditions

there. The said Nickerson, moreover, has had amicable relations with Chinese merchants and has worked on congenial lines with them. I consider it necessary, therefore, to appoint the said Nickerson to be Commercial Agent for us with the duty of keeping a watch over commercial conditions, and whenever there happens to be anything important, on the one hand, to report such to His Excellency the Chinese Minister at Washington, while, on the other, he, the said Nickerson, is to cable the same to me in order to keep us here in China posted on commercial matters in the United States and enable us to be prompt in acting thereon.

"The said Commercial Agent is specially appointed by me, the Viceroy of the Two Kuang provinces, to keep a watch on commercial matters, as he is specially fitted for such duties, owing to his intimate knowledge of trade conditions. As for diplomatic matters affecting the relations between ourselves and the United States Government, the manipulation thereof remains as usual in the hands of His Excellency the Chinese Minister at Washington, who in all matters thereanent will put himself in communication with the Foreign Department of the United States Government. This will prevent any encroachments on the duties of each.

"Upon receipt of this Commission of Appointment, the said Commercial Agent will obey his instructions and act therein.

"(Signed) Chou Fu.

Seal of the Viceroy of
the Two Kuang provinces.

"The 32nd year of H. I. M.

Kuang Hsu, 12th month, 8th day,
(21st of January, 1907.)"

Not alone, however, in South China was the warm desire for closer commercial relations with the United States manifested in high Chinese official quarters. On proceeding from Canton to North China, while at Peking at the Wai-Wu-Pu (Foreign Office) it was found that the highest officials evinced much interest in the matter of enlarged commercial relations with the American people. In private interviews with certain great officers of state, and with leading Imperial and Viceregal officials, as well as when formally received at the Wai-Wu-Pu, the same spirit was displayed. It was not necessary to linger long in the shadow of the few leafless trees of Legation Street, nor to pass nights listening to the tinkling bells hanging from the necks of the camels leading the caravans moving with silent footfalls towards the Occident, to realize the cordial desire for commercial intercourse with America that animated high official circles.

Furnished with a letter of introduction from the Wai-Wu-Pu, the writer retraced his steps to Tientsin, where he was equipped with the following despatch from His Excellency the Viceroy

Yuan Shih Kai, whereby that most illustrious great man gave him a commission, all the more important because it issued from the Viceroy of the metropolitan province. It is here shown:

"I, Yuan Shih Kai, Imperial High Commissioner, Junior Guardian of the Heir Apparent, Honorary President of the Board of War, Honorary Director of the Censorate, Imperial Commissioner of trade for the Pei Yang, Viceroy of Chihli, issue the following:

"Whereas, it has been an acknowledged fact that Chinese merchants in the United States have hitherto carried on a thriving trade; and,

"Whereas, the various products of North China have gradually improved and must find outlets for exportation;

"Therefore, it is the opportune moment to avail ourselves of the ripe experience of Mr. Nickerson, acting as Consul at Boston, United States of America, and appoint him to investigate the condition of trade, taking with him our products to the said United States and make inquiries in different cities whether or not such products may have a demand in the market, and to make reports at intervals on the subject in order to expand trade.

"Besides sending notices to others to this effect, I hereby forward to Mr. Nickerson this necessary document, trusting that he will carry out the matter herein contained. 18th day of the 2nd moon, Kuang Hsu, 32nd year." (Signature and seal of the Viceroy.)

We are probably considering the greatest question that one race has ever had to consider as to another, when we consider the attitude of the Americans towards the Chinese—the best of all Asiatics. This generation of Americans has no right to longer impede the development of the great commerce possible across the Pacific, and thereby obstruct the future welfare of those who are to come after us. Chinese laborers might be digging the Panama Canal, which lies in a climate inhospitable to the white race; they might be developing the Philippine Islands, which also lie in an inhospitable climate; but, instead, they are likely to turn to the development of Mongolia and Manchuria.

It is not certain that there is to-day any treaty about Immigration legally in force between China and the United States, though this statement would meet prompt denial from the United States Government. Is it too much to hope that the question of our relations with China may at last be approached in a spirit of the broadest and wisest statesmanship, and that a treaty may be made between the two Powers that will be on a plane where both practicality and justice can be found?

STEPHEN WESTCOTT NICKERSON.

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY CLARENCE H. GAINES, LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX AND LAWRENCE
GILMAN.

"THE WHOLE FAMILY"*

EVERY one is aware that collaboration in fiction has not always proved a happy expedient; and when we find twelve leading American authors joining forces in the production of a single story, our first emotion is one of strong curiosity as to whether in this case the artistic end has justified the rather daring means. Upon examination, one is relieved to find that diversity of authorship, while it has certainly promoted mordancy of character-drawing and unexpectedness of plot, has in no way spoiled the reasonableness and balanced power of the story as a whole. Just as a game of chess, if perfectly played, proves in the end to be a complete, organic structure, despite the fact that it is born anew with every move of the players, so this story, which is created afresh by each author in turn, develops into a consistent and artistic form, because it obeys throughout the basic laws of fiction and of life.

Thus through the co-operation of different minds a many-sided interest is insured and the feeling of suspense is sharpened without a sacrifice of artistic truth. But however strongly the story holds us by its plot and however keenly it stimulates curiosity by its presentation of highly individual view-points, we are inevitably led on, in any consideration of the novel in its entirety, to look for its "philosophy"—its underlying significance as a literary phenomenon. It is surprising, perhaps, in view of its

* "The Whole Family." By William Dean Howells, Mary Wilkins Freeman, Mary Stewart Cutting, Elizabeth Jordan, John Kendrick Bangs, Henry James, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Edith Wyatt, Mary R. S. Andrews, Alice Brown, and Henry van Dyke. New York: Harper & Brothers.

composite workmanship, that the story should have any "philosophy" at all. But true it is that the whole narrative is one in atmosphere, one in temperament of style, and one in spirit. Because of this fundamental unity it gives us an insight into the art of certain representative American authors that could perhaps be gained in no other way, while it strikingly illustrates the characteristics of that "new literature" which is daily growing up around us.

Of course, this does not necessarily imply that "The Whole Family" is a solemn effort to exemplify the best in modern American fiction. Because the story is continually amusing, often hilariously funny, and sometimes capricious in its manner of taking the reader unawares, it has all the greater significance for the critic. There is, to be sure, a somewhat "larky" tone about the whole performance, of which the reader is pleasantly conscious. Each author seems to have been put upon his mettle in standing sponsor for a very positive though not unnatural type of character—in undertaking to make us feel the attractiveness of that character even in the moments of intimate self-appreciation that come to every one, and in portraying with subtle obviousness the inevitable faults and limitations. The necessity for special pleading on the part of the authors seems to have sharpened the satire of the criticisms passed by each member of the Family upon the others, and the story becomes in one aspect a most diverting commentary upon the ingenious follies of human nature.

But while "The Whole Family" shows with delicate humor how plausibly the cleverest and best-intentioned people may hypnotize each other and auto-suggest themselves into a ridiculous frame of mind, it is far more than truthfully absurd and whimsically wise. None of the authors could have helped being fundamentally in earnest, and all have proved faithful to certain homely yet spiritual ideals that lie at the base of American life. Every character which they have portrayed has some quality that is worth while—some hold on the eternal verities—and the psychology of the story is subordinated to its human feeling. The complexities of modern life supply much of the comedy, as they should, and these complexities, as reflected and parodied in the behavior of the two children who add so greatly to the gayety of the Family, become intensely funny. But the sentiment springs from the old elemental sources, as all genuine sentiment

must. That a young man after becoming engaged to an adorable girl of his own age (his classmate in a coeducational college) should conceive himself to be madly in love with the maiden aunt of his *fiancée*; that all the members of the girl's family should forthwith work themselves into a "state" over this situation, and that each should stir into the witches' broth of the misunderstanding his own personal mixture of hurt feeling, pride and prejudice, good or bad taste—all this is part and parcel of our supersensitive modern life as it is lived. That a grandmother should feel herself hopelessly shut out from the mature life of her only daughter; that a gentle-souled mother should grieve in self-enforced silence over the transitory love-sorrow of her child; that a doting father, blind to the intricacies of the feminine mind, should at length fulminate a decision designed at all costs to save his "little girl"—all this, and much else in the story, is as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be.

There is real depth of feeling in this tale which is so subtle in its contrasts, so piquant in its variety, so enlivening in its surprises; and in truly American fashion the emotional appeal is associated with a wholesome common-sense that leaves us in the end not merely tantalized, but satisfied. Moreover, in its play of psychological moonlight over the troubled surface of a spiritual sea which remains in its depths undisturbed, "The Whole Family" seems very typical of the "new literature" in this country. It illustrates in a novel, attractive and not too serious form both sides of our modern fiction and our modern life—the sensitiveness to ideas, the sane, matter-of-fact recognition of things as they are. The book will be keenly enjoyed by all readers of to-day, and the future critic who writes the literary history of this period will not be likely to pass it over in silence.

CLARENCE H. GAINES.

"THE WAY OF PERFECT LOVE"*

It is neither the legitimate drama nor yet a natural and real presentation of life that we have to deal with in Georgiana Goddard King's beautiful symbolic poem, "The Way of Perfect Love"; rather it is a decorative composition, half pastoral, half lyric masque, done after the manner of the early Renaissance

* "The Way of Perfect Love." By Georgiana Goddard King. The Macmillan Co. 1908.

painting; and as in such painting, it is not so much a copy of reality as a presentation of meanings that is offered us. This the author makes clear in the prose interpretation at the end of the poem. Who knows and loves the great era of Italian painting will find the hours spent in reading this poem not unlike a stroll into the placid background of an Umbrian painting. Indeed, the very faces of the characters as they look out upon us rise from old canvases and the accustomed eye will surely recognize Mantegna's Duke of Mantua, the Duchess as a Dosso Dossi Madonna, and among the handmaidens there are Leonardo's faintly smiling ladies and those, too, of Ambrogio da Predis, with their gentle and subtle eyes. Indeed, the characters have each their own accessories, their favorite *imprese* in the manner of the other art, as the Duchess who appears ever in conjunction with the sunflower and wearing the devices of the lioness and the eaglet in the brocading of her mantle and the fashioning of her jewelry. Each of the handmaidens, too, Arianna, Mafalda, Orsola, Ippolyta, Laodomia, Isotto and Fiametta—a poem lying hid just in their singing names—have each a special trait whereby they are known, the long white throat of one or the slender hands or thin red lips of others. Frankly, all this is decoration, but woven into the play are also modern meanings. Surely the three spinners, whose songs touch with malice or with encouragement the listener, stand for the world's wisdom. In the scene with Piepowder, the Wayfarer, it is a duel of worldly wisdom with the free and roving imagination and their attempt is to hem in the artistic temper and give it the sense that there is no escape from the world and its timely canniness. Thus Eva's song to the perturbed wanderer who has lost his love because he cannot wear shackles on his soul, and who now searches in compunction, is meant to bring before him an example of one who tries for the life abundant by means of much and unsifted experience and who ends in hell.

Micaëla's song is faintly reminiscent of Maeterlinck and is lovely enough to quote entire:

"Three queens in the tower are spinning a thread;
Over their laps it lies tangled and red.

"In the choking white sea fog the stones drip with rime
And hushed is the bell that rang vespers and prime.

"—Is it finished? My fingers are wrinkled with cold;
We were spinning so long we must be very old.

"—A lock of the fine scarlet wool is unspent;
But the vair on our bosoms is faded and rent.

"Strong from the void mounts the cry of the tide,
While never sweet airs blow the cold mist aside.

"—The sun is dead, sister; it darkens to night,
And how shall we measure the thread without light?

"Our lamps at the stair foot were left long ago,
But we are too feeble to venture below."

Here in contrast to the sister's song we have a picture of those who shrink from the dangers of full life and who for safety's sake seek shelter in a high tower or an enclosed garden where the glare and the noise of reality do not penetrate. But night falls upon them, none the less, and it is to catch them empty-handed, feeble and terrified. These two disheartening alternatives are crowned by Maddalena's song, which is a bit of pure and well-known folk-lore (excepting the two final lines, which must have been drawn from some more recondite source) the gist of which seems to be the old Calvinistic theory of predestination and the assertion that nothing matters; that we are in Fate's hands and as we are born so will our life be. After all, however, it is easy to see that the poet has used her spinners as Shakespeare did his witches, merely to emphasize and intensify the thinker's own attitude, bewildering the bewildered, but strengthening the strong and to set these earthly forces in opposition to the imaginative or the religious life, both of which undertake to transmute experience and to derive beauty from ugliness, good from evil.

The Duchess, we should fancy, is the adventurer who leaves her enclosed gardens where her handmaidens bedeck and shield and divert her and where the Duke would fain shelter her from all experience, to go with the unknown and the unfelt, with the Wayfarer to try life.

Later the soul's freedom seeming to deny her the highest allegiance, she tries the pastoral life and staunches her wounds with the simple, natural cares and affections. And here the Shepherd shelters her. He is a gentle creature, led by the instincts and the affections, who, after the manner of the ancient mystics, *knows* just in as far as he loves. By virtue of the poignancy and sin-

cerity of his feeling he is able, when the struggle meets him, to transfer his earthly love to an heavenly devotion, so that giving all to love, love never fails him but more and more illuminates unto the perfect day. And this manner of love and of thought was, after all, the manner of St. Catherine of Siena, St. Theresa, the admirable Ruysbroeck and greater than they.

The Duchess, the seeker, is in the midway between heaven and earth with emotions and insights neither simple nor sure. Her way to perfection is the thorny one of many mistakes. Her emotions are all intellectualized and she seeks knowledge, sanity, health by testing her inward impulses. Her saving virtue is spiritual sincerity which often consists with extraordinary changes of front. Her course might easily be mistaken by the onlooker because her goal is visible only to her own eyes and the way opens before her and closes behind unmarked, even as the way of a ship in the sea. Hers is the modern nature to which renouncement is negation and atrophy, but which learns and grows only by absorption and assimilation, and ultimately finds its vocation in the administrative life of ceaseless growth and readjustment and therefore allies itself with the Duke, the man of science and the modern.

The allegory might be more easily understood in this day and generation if it were pointed out that the Duchess and Piepowder have practically effected an exchange of the conventional attributes and temperaments; so that the Duchess should be judged as a man and Piepowder as a woman. The Duchess finds completion in the active life, Piepowder in the imaginative. At the last, he, being the finest creation of the book, fitly holds the stage and delivers what is apparently the writer's ultimate view that love unfulfilled, so it but leave scope for dreams, is better than any satisfaction, and the soul's freedom with all its loneliness is higher than comfort:

"So shall forever young desire
Quickened and warmed by his own fire,
Following the still advancing goal,
Guard silence in the enfranchised soul."

There are a great many single lines of significance and beauty throughout the poem, such as:

"The stars can counsel and can bless."

"So men sleep, after stricken fields.
So women when their hearts are eased.
Babes, too, that sob and are appeased."

"To want is more than to attain."

"Exiles we wander, stubborn sons of Eve,
Striving the gray day's burdens to deceive."

There is little poetry born in our Western world and such as comes is rarely met with acclaim or worthy of it, but the quality of the little book before us bespeaks a future harvest and it is no light pleasure for the moment to be led from the dust and din and clatter of our modern life into this "flowery nunnery."

LOUISE COLLIER WILLCOX.

A STUDY OF RICHARD STRAUSS.*

THE critic whose subject is music has probably to face as difficult a task as falls to the lot of any appraiser who chooses to regard with seriousness his function as a gauger of æsthetic values. Not only has he to deal with a kind of artistic material which is generally conceded to be of unparalleled subtlety and elusiveness, but he confronts an intellectual product which is in a constant state of flux and alteration. The instability of music is unique among the arts. Its essential elements change almost with every decade. The harmonic effects which are, to-day, at the disposal of any graduate from a conservatory class in composition, simply did not exist for Schumann—not to speak of Beethoven or Mozart; and the innovation of to-day is the platitude of to-morrow. Certain forms of musical expression which, when first used by path-breakers like Chopin, Liszt, and Wagner, occasioned shrill protests from the critical conservatives—who alone are timeless, deathless and immutable—have now passed into the common language of the art, and are at the service of every tyro who has learned how to put notes together; and, by the same token, harmonies which, as used to-day by Richard Strauss or Claude Debussy, are for many ears wanton and preposterous, and are denied all right to be classified as "music," will as certainly seem to the aural sense of our grandchildren not less innocently traditional than the cadences of "Home, Sweet Home."

* "Richard Strauss" ("Living Masters of Music" Series). By Ernest Newman. New York and London: John Lane Company.

That an art which is capable of such unexampled mutations must set uncommon pitfalls in the way of its critics is fairly obvious. To write of it with any positiveness, either in praise or in blame, is to run an appalling risk of having one's decisions utterly reversed by succeeding generations. The critic who half a century ago, in all sincerity, called Wagner's "*Tristan und Isolde*" "cat music," cuts a sufficiently unenviable figure to-day; but are our own wise and excellent deliverances upon this perilously mercurial art any surer of being honored in the futurity which awaits them? The least we can do is to be deliberate and cautious in blame and—in the admirable phrase of Mr. James—"infinitely curious and incorrigibly patient" in appreciation; to be, in short, "indefatigably supple"—which is truly a formidable order!

One is moved to these reflections by the fact that Mr. Ernest Newman has taken the bull resolutely by the horns in this matter and has undertaken to write of the life and to appraise the works of the most inflammatory and indeterminable of living composers, and one, moreover, about whom the winds of controversy have blown more violently than about any music-maker since Wagner—no less a composer, in short, than Richard Strauss. Mr. Newman has not now, though, to demonstrate his possession of the faculty of initiative in matters of critical approach. Recognized to-day as the foremost English music-critic, he is conspicuous among his craft for the independence—often revolutionary in trend—of his judgments, and for the scholarship, balance and serenity with which he enforces them. He has, moreover, long been known as the most penetrating and sympathetic of Strauss's critics; so that he comes to his task with a peculiarly fit equipment.

The series to which his book is a contribution has already yielded monographs upon Puccini, Grieg, Elgar, Paderewski, Joachim, Bruneau and Debussy. The avowed aim of the series is to offer intimate and sympathetic studies, personal and critical, of the most conspicuous figures in the modern musical world. Mr. Newman in his preface expresses regret at his inability to give his book "the personal touch that is one of the objects of the series in which it appears," since, as he avows, he is personally unacquainted with Strauss. He has devoted the space at his disposal, he says, to an attempt "to trace the main lines of his [Strauss's] intellectual and musical development, and to indi-

cate some of the new æsthetic problems that are raised by his work." This purpose he has accomplished with notable justice, lucidity and succinctness. He begins by tracing in outline the career of Strauss; then follow chapters in which he takes up in turn the earlier and later instrumental works, the songs and choral works, and the operas. The volume is prefaced with a note, "Richard Strauss: The Man," written by Mr. Alfred Kalisch, from which we learn, in the course of thirteen pages, nothing concerning the personality of the composer of "*Salome*" that is both important and new, and which might well have been omitted. It is pleasant to know that "in appearance Strauss is scrupulously neat always, without being in any sense fashionable"; but it is likely that most readers would have preferred to have these thirteen pages devoted to an extension of Mr. Newman's critical views, even at the cost of being left in the dark concerning the precise nature of Strauss's sartorial preoccupations. However, the demand for the "personal note" in contemporary æsthetic discussion is probably irresistible.

Mr. Newman, as has been said, is at once frank and appreciative in his estimate of Strauss. He compasses the difficult feat of praising him for that in his work which is admirable, and deploring that in it which is regrettable and inferior—a procedure which, in the case of most critics of the Munich tone-poet, is usually reversed. Thus he estimates rightly the value of Strauss's songs, comparatively few of which, he believes, have much chance of survival. When a musician, he observes, "can get forty or fifty pounds for a single lyric, as Strauss now can, the temptation to believe in the theory of his own plenary inspiration must be irresistible." Strauss, he thinks, "decidedly lacks that power of harmonious and balanced structure on a small scale that is the first essential of a song-writer." Of the much-berated and much-lauded "*Salome*" he speaks rather guardedly. Some parts of it, such as the scene between Salome and John, and the final scene of Salome with the head, he praises as "entrancingly beautiful"; and even where, he says, "the music is not beautiful, but merely a tissue of cunning *tours de force* of characterization and stage suggestion, it sweeps us off our feet." He is evidently, however, aware of the curiously disappointing character of the music as a whole. "The style," he observes, "has a good deal of that cold perversity that is so repellent in all Strauss's later

work. Difficulties are created simply for the pleasure of overcoming, or trying to overcome, them; the straight road to the desired end is ostentatiously avoided simply because it is straight. And although it is almost impossible for any man yet to make up his mind finally about '*Salome*,' it is quite clear that it marks no improvement on '*Don Quixote*' and '*Ein Heldenleben*' and the '*Symphonia Domestica*' in the one point in which improvement would have been most welcome. . . . We get from the opera the same impression as from the later orchestral works, that Strauss is incapable now of making a large picture sane and harmonious throughout; somewhere or other he must spoil it by extravagance and perversity and foolishness. He can do every clever and astounding thing that a musician could do; what he apparently cannot or will not do now is to write twenty continuous pages that shall be wholly beautiful and unmarred by bravado or by folly."

Though feeling, of course, that it is premature to attempt an estimate of the final value of a musician who is still only in his forty-fifth year, Mr. Newman is yet willing to say that he deems it certain that Strauss "has put into music a greater stress of feeling and a greater weight of thinking than any other composer of the day"; that, "with all his present faults," he remains "by far the most commanding figure in contemporary music," and that "he has already enriched music with more new ideas than any musician since Wagner"—a just verdict, I think, on the whole; yet one might question if Strauss's true achievement does not lie in the inspired manipulation and transformation of the musical brain-stuff which certain of his predecessors had left for him, rather than in the creation of such a wholly new order of ideas as we find in the unique scores of Debussy. There is, after all, a large element at the basis of Strauss's music for which he is indebted, despite his enormous and indisputable originality of method, to Liszt and Wagner; whereas for the "*Pelléas et Mélisande*" and "*La Mer*" of Debussy there are no analogies or apparent sources whatsoever.

Altogether, Mr. Newman has made a courageous and admirable contribution to the literature of an engrossing subject—the amazing, saddening, preposterous, inspired, incomparable tone-poet from Munich.

LAWRENCE GILMAN.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: CONSTANTINOPLE: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *November, 1908.*

ON November 1, 1858, Queen Victoria issued the famous proclamation that closed the horrors of the Indian Mutiny with a word of peace and hope, and announced that henceforward the rule of the East India Company was to cease and the administration of the great dependency to be taken over by the Crown. Fifty years later to the day her son, the present King of England and Emperor of India, issued a further proclamation. The Queen's proclamation outlined a policy and formulated a number of specific pledges; the King's is a ringing, confident claim that that policy has been carried out, those pledges redeemed. But it is more than that. It is one of the most impressive State papers that I have ever had the fortune to come across. In stateliness of language, in its consciousness of power used for noble ends, in its just, tempered, but not vainglorious pride in all that has been accomplished in the British name, and in the spirit of mingled benignity and firmness that breathes in every line, it seems to me a message eminently worthy of a sovereign to whose lot it has fallen to guide the destinies of one-fifth of the human race. It was received in India with a great outburst of loyalty and rejoicing. "We survey our labors of the past half-century," says the King-Emperor, "with clear gaze and good conscience"; and in a passage which I venture to reproduce in full he reviews some of the achievements of the British rulers of India:

"Difficulties such as attend all human rule in every age and place have risen up from day to day. They have been faced by the servants of the British Crown with toil and courage and patience, with deep counsel and a resolution that has never faltered nor shaken. If errors have occurred, the agents of my Government have spared no pains and no self-sacrifice to correct them; if abuses have been proved, vigorous hands have labored to apply a remedy.

"No secret of Empire can avert the scourge of drought and plague, but experienced administrators have done all that skill and devotion are capable of doing to mitigate those dire calamities of Nature. For a longer period than was ever known in your land before you have escaped the dire calamities of war within your borders. Internal peace has been unbroken.

"In the great charter of 1858 Queen Victoria gave you noble assurance of her earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all resident therein. The schemes that have been diligently framed and executed for promoting your material convenience and advance—schemes unsurpassed in their magnificence and boldness—bear witness before the world to the zeal with which that benignant promise has been fulfilled.

"The rights and privileges of the Feudatory Princes and Ruling Chiefs have been respected, preserved and guarded; and the loyalty of their allegiance has been unswerving. No man among my subjects has been favored, molested or disquieted by reason of his religious belief or worship. All men have enjoyed protection of the law. The law itself has been administered without disrespect to creed or caste, or to usages and ideas rooted in your civilization; it has been simplified in form, and its machinery adjusted to the requirements of ancient communities slowly entering a new world.

"The charge confided to my Government concerns the destinies of countless multitudes of men now and for ages to come; and it is a paramount duty to repress with a stern arm guilty conspiracies that have no just cause and no serious aim. These conspiracies I know to be abhorrent to the loyal and faithful character of the vast hosts of my Indian subjects, and I will not suffer them to turn me aside from my task of building up the fabric of security and order.

The message goes on to promise "steadfast and sure progress" in admitting natives to "posts of public authority and power," and in extending "the principle of representative institutions." To mark this historic anniversary His Majesty orders the remission or curtailment of sentences on prisoners and announces that at the New Year he will honor the Indian troops with a substantial recognition—in the form, no doubt, of increased pay—of their "martial instincts, their splendid discipline, and their faithful readiness of service." Finally the King-Emperor declares that ever since his visit in 1875 he has watched the interests of India, its Princes and Peoples, "with an affectionate solicitude that time cannot weaken"; and he adds that "these sincere feelings of active sympathy and hope for India on the part of my Royal House and Line only represent, and they do most truly

represent, the deep and united will and purpose of the people of this Kingdom."

I do not think there is a single statement in this remarkably virile and candid proclamation that cannot be fully substantiated. British rule in India has entered just now upon troubled waters, and the need for a hand on the rudder that will be not merely strong, but deft and sensitive, is probably destined to grow in urgency. The successes of the last half-century are not in themselves a guarantee that the wholly novel problems now pressing for solution will be satisfactorily handled. But they afford some encouragement to hope that the future will not fall below the high record of the past. What, at least, will not be disputed is that the achievements of the British since 1858 in extending and consolidating their Indian dominions, in devising a system that sends out the best men the country can produce to administer them, in preserving peace among three hundred million peoples with a British force of less than 80,000 men, in fighting famine and plague, in scrupulously observing all treaties and engagements with the native Princes who still rule two-fifths of the country, in respecting, often with an almost excessive tenderness, the faiths and customs of their wards, in building 30,000 miles of railway and 200,000 miles of roads, in irrigating nearly fifty million acres of land, in quadrupling the value of Indian imports and exports, in dealing out an inflexible and even-handed justice, in introducing industries and improving agriculture, in extending education, in setting up some 750 municipalities and over a thousand district and local boards for the training of the natives in the responsibilities of self-government, and in handing over practically all the subordinate posts in the civil administration and a small but increasing number in the higher grades to Indians—no one, I say, can deny that these achievements constitute a unique record of energetic, upright and successful government. How, having constructed, to assimilate—this is now the fundamental problem confronting the British in India. The whole spirit of the King's proclamation is proof enough, if any were needed, that it will not be shirked.

Since "The Times" twenty-three years ago revealed Germany's intention to force a second war upon France, no newspaper article has made such a profound sensation in England and throughout Europe as the interview with the Kaiser which

appeared in the "Daily Telegraph" in the last week of October. Almost every sentence in it was an indiscretion. After some warm expressions of indignation that the English should still persist in mistrusting his friendship, the Kaiser proceeded to prove its reality by announcing that in the crisis of the Boer war he drew up a plan of campaign and sent it to Queen Victoria at Windsor, and that when Russia suggested and France approved united representations to put an end to the war, the Kaiser stood out and refused to take part in any anti-British movement.

These were the principal revelations of an "interview" that from the first line to the last was full of piquant disclosures and suggestions. Its effect was immediate and prodigious. In Germany Prince Bülow promptly offered to resign, and the entire German people turned against their Kaiser in something like a frenzy of execration. In England there was an explosion of amazed laughter at the officiousness of the Kaiser in volunteering a plan of campaign for defeating his friends, the Boers. In France and Russia every newspaper and Government official set to work at once to disprove the Kaiser's story of the intervention. All Europe was for days convulsed with denials and explanations, charges and countercharges. The truth is, I believe, that Russia did actually propose and that France was not unwilling to entertain a scheme for putting pressure on Great Britain to bring the South-African war to a conclusion. Englishmen feel they can afford to forget it nowadays or, if they remember it at all, it is without the least trace of vindictiveness, and merely as a relic of an unhappy and outworn period in British diplomatic history. But the reason why the scheme fell through was that Germany's co-operation in it was made conditional on a formal acquiescence by France in the permanent loss of Alsace-Lorraine. M. Delcassé thought the price too high and the conspirators disbanded. It was not from any kindly feeling towards the English, but simply to serve the ends of her European policy, that Germany put forward the stipulation which killed the project almost before it was born. The Kaiser was as willing to sacrifice England for the sake of Alsace-Lorraine as to sacrifice the Boers for the sake of placating England. Thanks to the further revelations called forth by the "Daily Telegraph" interview, this is now well understood in England; and Anglo-German relations, I need hardly add, are not improved thereby.

CONSTANTINOPLE, November, 1908.

Soon after the downfall of absolutism in the Ottoman Empire the Young Turks with a forefeeling of their country's future greatness asked whether they might not in time aspire to re-enter into possession of Crete, Cyprus, Egypt, Samos, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Bazar. A legitimate patriotic dream. Well, it was this harmless aspiration that furnished Baron von Aehrenthal with the pretext for which he longed. And it was soon supplemented by petitions in which the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina craved a constitution such as their fellow subjects in Turkey had received. Now the bestowal of a constitution, the Austrian Foreign Minister argued, implies annexation. It is as needless to discuss this thesis as it would have been for the lamb in the fable to adduce arguments against the allegations of the wolf. It was a case of "*hoc volo, sic jubeo*." Austria disposes of a formidable army. Germany, who will see her through the crisis, possesses an army more formidable still. Turkey, on the other hand, is literally defenceless, and the three Powers willing to back her can offer nothing more helpful than moral sympathies, with which she could not defend Adrianople or Dedeagatch. And in order that Turkey and her pacific friends should realize the situation, Austria dexterously thrust Prince Ferdinand forward and alarmed Europe with the spectre of a Turco-Bulgarian war.

In Vienna, Sofia, Constantinople, Paris and St. Petersburg I have had the privilege within the span of a few weeks of hearing most of the actors in this European drama give their own version of each of the acts and also their candid opinions of their fellow actors. And having winnowed sentiment from fact in these graphic sketches I find it impossible to avoid the conclusion that the brilliancy of the *coup* accomplished by Baron von Aehrenthal is dulled by certain of the methods to which he had recourse in order to achieve it. To affirm that the elaborate hoodwinking of the diplomatic representatives of foreign states, the conveying of erroneous impressions by implication and allusion whereby they were caused to mislead their respective Governments very materially, were amongst that Minister's methods, is to put a strong case with generous euphemism. That Baron von Aehrenthal resembles the bee which, having left its sting in the wound, can never again inflict pain, is the obvious inference.

In September, the Austrian Embassies, seconding the work of Baron von Aehrenthal, assured the press of the countries to which they were accredited that the intention attributed to Austria-Hungary of annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina, and thus violating the Berlin Treaty, had no existence in fact, and these assurances and statements were credited at the time because Austria possessed an excellent reputation for plain dealing and her Foreign Secretary was believed to be acquiring one.

One of the legends disseminated by the Austrian Government was that Bulgaria had no intention of proclaiming her independence, because, among other reasons, Austria-Hungary would surely know of it. She had been informed of such a plan last year, for instance, it was added, when she promptly vetoed it; and she had heard nothing this year from the Bulgarian Cabinet about any such project. This statement, literally true and really false, was duly transmitted by the embassies in Vienna to their respective Governments. The Bulgarian Cabinet in the persons of its most influential members put a very different complexion on the matter. And this is what they told me. The Principality was ripe for independence long ago, but the leaders of the nation had patriotically resolved to wait until the Bulgars of Macedonia were incorporated in Prince Ferdinand's realm, which then, without more ado, would become a kingdom and independent simultaneously. And patience was all the more easy that Bulgaria was a vassal only in name—a name, too, that brought her no inconvenience and great advantages, political and economic, and that the reward of her good behavior was already in sight. The Powers had lost patience with the Sultan, the three Macedonian provinces would soon be withdrawn from his sceptre and then Bulgaria's dream would come true.

These hopes were dashed by the emancipation of Turkey from the demoralizing absolutism of Abdul Hamid. Turkey's integrity was henceforward safe from attack. As there was now, therefore, no longer anything to be gained by waiting, it was resolved that the declaration of independence should be made without delay. But delay was unavoidable because the Prince and the Premier were both absent.

Baron von Aehrenthal, still protesting that Bulgaria would not declare her independence, had royal honors shown to Prince Ferdinand on his entry into Budapest. At the same time mem-

bers of the Bulgarian cabinet, and in particular the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, was telling his friends in Sofia that Austria-Hungary was about to tear up the Treaty of Berlin by annexing the occupied provinces and that Bulgaria would follow her example. And yet the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs got no inkling of this semi-public information!

Young Turkey through all her bewildering troubles continued to manifest an attitude so moderate, so generous and so statesmanlike that friends and adversaries alike augured genial things of the great unknown counsellors behind the cabinet. To the annexation of the occupied provinces she replied with a dignified protest and a reasonable demand for pecuniary compensation; Bulgaria's independence would, she intimated, be duly acknowledged by the Porte simultaneously with recognition by the signatory Powers, but her property rights in the railway and the Roumelian tribute did not, she contended, lapse with the nominal vassalage of Bulgaria. The anonymous committee that guides the policy of the Empire from the safe retreat of Salonica, went further in the path of conciliation. An unofficial deputation was sent to Sofia to fraternize with the Bulgars and assure them that as the two nations would need each other's help in the future they had better begin friendly negotiations at once. I talked with the Turkish delegates in Sofia and with the Bulgarian delegates there and in Constantinople. They were all anxious for a close friendship preparatory to an alliance between the two states.

But the trials, internal and external, of constitutional Turkey are by no means at an end. To Austria her very existence is an eyesore and her prosperity would be a standing menace. A Turco-Bulgarian alliance, once the Ottoman army is reorganized, would effectually thwart the ambitious designs of the Hapsburgs and force Germany to abandon all hope of recovering the unique position of influence in Turkey which she lost when Abdul Hamid was deprived of power.

Although the danger of war seems past, a dark storm-cloud still hangs heavy in the Eastern sky. Bulgaria continues to overstrain her financial resources and check commercial enterprise by keeping fifty thousand superfluous soldiers under arms and Turkey has come to a complete standstill at a moment when quiescence is almost identical with retrogression. At present external difficulties are her bane. These once removed, her chances

of coping successfully with domestic troubles would perhaps rise to the level of probability.

But one cannot blink the fact that hitherto achievement has fallen far short of promise. Hitherto the Young Turks have been seemingly vying with the ancient Christians in the practice of self-denial, meekness, brotherly love, humility and other negative virtues. Government as they have established it has a certain remote resemblance to the anarchy tempered with altruism which was sung by Shelley and is preached by Tolstoy.

But with negative qualities, even though they be Christian virtues, one cannot build up an Empire. And creative, nay constructive, forces are nowhere visible as yet. Young Turkey lacks leaders for the reform movement and, what perhaps is worse, she lacks intelligent, trustworthy, energetic partisans. True, strong characters, magnetic shepherds of men, may emerge from the seething whirl of races and religions, but as yet there is none in view. And the feat to be achieved is hardly less arduous than a mediæval miracle. A powerful nation has to be fashioned out of ethnic fragments that have hitherto repelled in lieu of attracting each other. An army has to be got together out of excellent human materials, it is true, but without experienced generals, tested strategists, trusty non-commissioned officers, ammunition, clothing or money. In like manner the navy must be created out of nothing. Further, tribunals are waiting for a cleansing such as Hercules gave the stables of the King of Elis.

Then presumably education will perpetuate the barriers that divide Greek from Turk, Arab, Armenian, Kurd and Albanian, while religion with its large infusion of politics must tend to keep Christian, Jew and Moslem from fusing with each other in Ottoman citizenship. And as the races and religions are scattered throughout the Empire, the task of the future Empire-builders is in truth Herculean and calls for an organizing genius. And yet there is good hope.

As the Turkish revolution was a miracle of moderation and thoroughness, in the possibility of which nobody would have believed on the eve of its accomplishment, so it is but fair that we hold back our forecast of the Ottoman renaissance until we have seen the Turkish Parliament assembled, when possibly another miracle may evoke our admiration and quicken our faith in the potentialities of man.

WASHINGTON, November, 1908.

AMONG the innumerable students of the returns of the late Presidential election, there are many who have drawn the inference that Mr. Bryan will never again run for the Presidency, and there are some who, under the first shock of disappointment, have gone so far as to say that we shall never see another Democratic Chief Magistrate. The veteran politicians of whom the Federal capital is full are inclined to think that the former forecast will be verified, although there is some doubt about it; but that the latter is by no means warranted by the facts. Assuming that the official figures will give Mr. Bryan the three electoral votes of Nevada, six out of eight electoral votes of Maryland and the five electoral votes of Colorado, we can see that he will have 162 electoral votes; or, in other words, 22 more electoral votes than were cast for ex-Judge Parker; 7 more than Bryan himself obtained in 1900, but 14 less than he got in 1896. It must also be said for him that he carried his own State of Nebraska, which had not delivered its electoral vote to a Democrat since 1896, and that he secured all the electoral votes of Kentucky, whereas he got but one of them twelve years ago. The fact remains that his Republican opponent will have almost twice as many electoral votes as he, and that, as regards the popular vote, the Republican plurality now exceeds 1,100,000, or is nearly twice as large as it was in 1896.

It is premature and optimistic, however, to take for granted that Bryan has retired from the field. He retains the power of putting himself continually before the people in the columns of his paper, "The Commoner," and he has announced that he will resume immediately the lecture tours which in the past have brought him a considerable revenue. It must not be forgotten, either, that in our political history there are some precedents for his persistency in aspiring to the office of Chief Magistrate. In 1789, 1792 and 1796 George Clinton of New York obtained more or less electoral votes for the Presidency, securing no fewer than 50 in the second of the years named, while in 1804 and 1808, he was actually elected Vice-President. Suppose Bryan should follow George Clinton's example, and, after running three times unsuccessfully for the Presidency, should accept a nomination for Vice-President in 1912? Let us look next at the experience of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney of South Carolina. He was a

candidate for the Presidency in 1796, but got only one electoral vote. He obtained 64 in 1800; 14 in 1804 and 47 in 1808. Henry Clay's example is still more suggestive. He got 34 electoral votes in 1824; 49 in 1832; 105 in 1844; and he was the most conspicuous candidate for the Whig nomination in 1848, and he would have got it had not Thurlow Weed, by his adroit wire-pulling, managed to beat him with Zachary Taylor. That is to say, the friends of Henry Clay in the Whig Convention of 1848 took the same position which the friends of Mr. Bryan would occupy should they request his nomination from the Democratic National Convention in 1912. With these examples and precedents at his fingers' ends, it is improbable that Mr. Bryan is as yet ready to acknowledge himself politically dead. Such, at least, is the opinion of some Washington observers who possess long memories. Whether, in view of this year's lesson, the American Democracy will ever again consent to make Mr. Bryan its standard-bearer, is a very different question. He has never been as popular with his party as Henry Clay was with the Whigs, who, nevertheless, put Clay aside in 1848—and won.

If, now, we turn to the Democracy, hypothetically considered as henceforth dissociated from Mr. Bryan's personal fortunes, it is certain that some cause for hope, rather than for discouragement, is discernible. There are proofs, on the face of the returns, that this year the general conditions were far less favorable to the success of the Republican party than they were in 1904. We must also recognize incontestable proofs that those Democrats who vehemently urged the Denver Convention to put forward some other standard-bearer than Bryan were abundantly justified. Not only have the Democrats made considerable gains in the House of Representatives, but, through the Legislatures just chosen, they will have gained also some United States Senators. Above all, they have elected Governors in Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota and North Dakota, although every one of those States was carried by Taft. They have come very near, to electing Governors in West Virginia, Michigan and even Illinois. It is now pretty clear that such a Democratic ticket as Harmon and Stevenson, or Harmon and Johnson, would have come near to subverting Republican ascendancy in the Central West. It is not, therefore, the Democratic party, but Mr. Bryan personally, who seems to have been discredited and disqualified by the late Presidential election. In

view of this indubitable fact, there is at last good reason to hope that the Democracy has shaken from its shoulders the man whose incessant strivings for the Presidency have kept his party dis-united for a dozen years. When we bear in mind that, judged by the ballots cast for Governors, the Republican plurality of the popular vote does not much exceed 400,000, we cannot but recognize that the Democratic party is better fitted than it has been since Grover Cleveland went out of office in March, 1897, to discharge the duties of an Opposition. It is fortunate for Republicans themselves that the Democracy has gained control of the State Governments in so many Northern States; for the fact will force them to watch the drift of intelligent opinion in those important, if not pivotal, commonwealths.

Is Mr. Roosevelt's influence waning rapidly? Of course, Republican office-seekers have already turned their faces from the setting to the rising sun. Already the pall of effacement, which has enfolded so many ex-Presidents, is beginning to cast its shadow on the man who has only about three months longer in which to retain the office of Chief Magistrate. The fate of many of his predecessors may well depress him. Jefferson, and, for that matter, Madison, left the White House bankrupts. Obscure and pitiful was the existence to which the author of the Monroe Doctrine was condemned in his last years. What had Franklin Pierce or Chester A. Arthur to fall back upon? Benjamin Harrison was glad, in his retirement, to accept a fee from a railway corporation. Grover Cleveland consented to become an employee of a life-insurance company. John Quincy Adams and Andrew Johnson alone insisted upon proving that they retained capacities of public usefulness by returning to public life at Washington, the one as Representative, the other as a Senator. Mr. Roosevelt, apparently, expects to keep himself in the public eye by imitating Mr. Bryan—that is to say, by accepting an editorial post on a weekly periodical, though in his past we can find no reason for assuming that, once stripped of the aureole of the Presidency, he is qualified to discharge the editorial function. It is the opinion of many close observers at Washington that Mr. Roosevelt has made a blunder in his choice of a post-Presidential profession, and that there was just one sagacious thing for him to do, and that was to become a member of the United States Senate.

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

Women and the Decalogue.

ONE reason why women cannot readily obtain equality with men is that their natures instinctively demand inequality. It is our firm conviction that the great majority of cases of domestic infelicity are attributable to the woman's resentment of a suspicion constantly in her mind that she is deprived of much to which she is fairly entitled, by reason either of her conscious superiority or even of her mere desire. We surely had every reason to suppose that women, previously unenlightened upon the subject, would accept with gratefulness the assurance which we adduced from Holy Writ to the effect that they are not bound by the proscriptions of our fundamental religious law. Imagine, then, our surprise at receiving scores of letters breathing vehement protestation! Instead of rejoicing over their immunity, as men surely would do, they demand inclusion within the circle of human beings held by divine command to a strict observance of the Commandments. While necessarily recognizing the nobility of the disposition thus manifested, one cannot but wonder at its fatuity from the standpoint of practical application. We shall not attempt, at this time, to analyze the emotion, obviously peculiar to femininity, which induces such a feeling. Doubtless the attitude is explicable, but its assumption is so unexpected and itself so strange that much cautious inquiry and calm reflection are requisite to perfect understanding. As a preliminary to further consideration, however, we submit one of the many communications which we have received.

"WASHINGTON, D. C.

"SIR,—When a young girl I once asked my father at family prayers why, in the Tenth Commandment, it did not say, 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's husband' as well as ' . . . thy neighbor's wife.' The fact that I grew up with six brothers as playmates and companions developed

in me rather early, perhaps, a spirit of good-natured emulation, and I expected, more than I desired, to be considered on an equal basis with them. My father, a Presbyterian Minister, by the way, gave me some answer which satisfied me perfectly at the time, and never in maturer years have I for one moment been troubled with any doubt lest Moses or the Giver of the law intended any slight to women by implying that they do not come fully under the provisions of the Decalogue. I do not remember the words my father used in his answer to me, but I was told, in effect, that the idea, and not the most exact expression of it, was the all-important thing. He cited various instances from the Bible and elsewhere in which for the sake of brevity or simplicity figures of speech are employed and are easily understood.

"I wish the Editor of the *Review* would turn to the twenty-third chapter of Exodus and glance at the twelfth verse. Here is a reiteration of a part of the Fourth Commandment. Please notice the phrase 'the son of thy handmaid.' Nothing is said of the 'daughter of the handmaid' nor of the manservant and maidservant themselves. According to the Editor's way of reasoning as applied to the form of the commands of the Decalogue, the omission is significant and indicates that the son of the handmaid was not only the most important servant in the household, but that rest for him was of more consequence than even for the son and the daughter of the head of the house.

"For the sake of a little entertainment, just to see whether we women take them seriously or not, I think that the Editor's comments on the exemption of women from the prohibitions of the Decalogue are well worth while from a man's point of view, provided he has an abundance of leisure on his hands. But I think that women have never considered themselves any less under the 'penalty of the law' because Moses failed to be more explicit. Of course the 'thou' in the Fourth Commandment includes man and woman. It corresponds to 'the reader' or 'my hearer,' who is generally assumed to be of either sex. How superfluous it would be, in the Tenth Commandment, if the phrase 'thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's husband' were inserted. We might infer from the wording used that instances of coveting neighbors' wives were more common in Moses' time than coveting neighbors' husbands. However that may be, we do not always look for precision of language in literature, especially in so ancient a book as the Bible.

"In Professor James's handbook on Psychology, after dividing 'the self' into two aspects, the I and the Me, he says, 'In its widest possible sense a man's Me is the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children, his ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his lands and horses, and yacht and bank account.' I cannot imagine a woman feeling slighted because Professor James considers 'a man's Me,' nor her supposing for one moment that Professor James thinks a woman's self of no consequence because he addresses his remarks primarily to men. Imagine Professor James writing, 'A man's or woman's Me is the sum total of all that he or she can call his or hers,

not only his or her body and his or her psychic powers, but his or her clothes and his or her house, his or her wife or husband and children,' and so on throughout the book. Such a style would appear ridiculous and would exhaust the reader's patience.

"Probably, after all, the Editor did not expect to be taken seriously. Being a woman, I *was* a little angry at first, but the second time I read the article through I saw the Editor laughing at me just as plainly as could be, so I forgave him, because, I thought, being a man he 'must have his little joke.'

"CORR. L. SNELL."

The passage in Exodus to which our correspondent refers is:

"Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid, and the stranger, may be refreshed."

This is one of the many amplifications of the Commandments made by Moses which are not regarded as having been fully inspired. Its particular reference obviously was to the son of the handmaid, as rest for the oxen and asses had already been enjoined explicitly. The head of the house, too, had been forbidden to require "any manner of work" from the stranger within his gates, but no provision had been made for the stranger's diversion. To meet the simple requirement of hospitality, this direction was given that he be "refreshed" or entertained in company with and presumably under the guidance of the son of the handmaid.

There was no inappropriateness in such an arrangement. Our correspondent errs in assuming that the son of the handmaid was a servant. His father was the head of the household, and his position was neither menial nor mean. It corresponded precisely, in fact, to that of Mormon children whose mothers are not first wives. Sarai established a custom when she voluntarily and most generously gave Hagar to Abram in order that the name might not become extinct. Subsequently she discovered that her magnanimous act had been unnecessary and was sorry, but meanwhile the willing Abram had taken the charming Egyptian girl to be his second wife, with Sarai's consent, and became the father of Ishmael, who has many descendants to this very day. The lad's social position was precarious for some time as a consequence of his mother's indiscreet boasting and Sarai's resentfulness, but was finally fixed definitely through divine interference and, when Abram was buried, Ishmael walked side by side with Isaac behind the hearse.

Whether Boaz was married when Naomi took Ruth to Bethlehem and directed her to proclaim herself the rich man's handmaid cannot be determined from the record, but circumstantial evidence clearly indicates that he had a wife who, in conformity with the Hebrew custom of that day and the Mormon custom of recent times, assented perforce to the addition of the attractive widow to the family when politely but firmly requested by her husband to do so. If so, then, of course, the great grandmother of David himself was a handmaid, in the Scriptural meaning of the term, and undoubtedly it was to such as his grandfather Obed that the injunction of Moses was meant to apply. It seems plain; therefore, that the omission from the verse in Exodus to which our correspondent refers is, indeed, significant and indicative of the verity of our original contention.

Whatever may be the view held by Professor James respecting the relative positions of the sexes, it surely does seem to be a fact that he "addresses his remarks primarily to men" and, unconsciously, perhaps, falls in with the ancient custom of regarding wives as property, in common with lands and horses. Our correspondent's illustration of redundant use of the possessive pronoun is, moreover, a wilful exaggeration and by no means convincing as evidence that a more explicit expression would "appear ridiculous" or should "exhaust a reader's patience." Indeed, there is nothing so refreshing, in these days of careless writing, as painstaking accuracy, although, of course, one should not approach the extreme of the illiterate person who emphasized his fidelity to the cause of complete sex evenness by distorting the familiar Latin adage into "*Mens et womens conscia recti.*"

LA SENTENCOJ DE SALOMONO.*

(*El la Biblio.*)

EL LA ORIGINALO TRADUKIS, L. L. ZAMENHOF.

CAPITRO XXIX.

(1) SE homo puninda restas obstina, li subite pereos sen ia helpo. (2) Kiam altiĝas virtuloj, la popolo ĝojas, sed kiam regas malvirtulo, la popolo ĝemas. (3) Homo, kiu amas saĝon, ĝojigas sian patron; sed kiukomuniĝas kun malĉastulinoj, disperdas sian havon. (4) Reĝo per justeco fortikigas la landon, sed donacamanto ĝin ruinigas. (5) Homo, kiu flatas al sia proksimulo, metas reton antaŭ liaj piedoj. (6) Per sia pekado malbona homo sin implikas, sed virtulo triumfas kaj ĝojas. (7) Virtulo penas ekkoni la aferon de malriĉuloj, sed malvirtulo ne povas kompreni. (8) Homoj blasfemantaj indignigas urbon, sed saĝuloj kvietigas koleron. (9) Se saĝa homo havas juĝan aferon kun homo malsaĝa, tiam, ĉu li koleras, ĉu li ridas, li ne havas trankvilon. (10) Sangaviduloj malamas senkulpulon, sed virtuloj zorgas pri lia vivo. (11) Sian tutan koleron aperigas malsaĝulo, sed saĝulo ĝin retenas. (12) Se reganto atentis mensogon, tiam ĉiuj liaj servantoj estas malvirtuloj. (13) Malriĉulo kaj proctegisto renkontiĝas; Dio donas lumon al la okuloj de ambaŭ. (14) Se reĝo juĝas juste malriĉulojn, lia trono fortikiĝas por ĉiam. (15) Kano kaj instruo donas saĝon; kaj knabo, lasita al si mem, hontigas sian patrinon. (16) Kiam altiĝas malvirtuloj, tiam multiĝas krimoj, sed virtuloj vidos ilian falon. (17) Punu

* Dr. Zamenhof has made this translation of Proverbs from the original text especially for THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. The first chapter appeared in the December, 1907, issue. The subsequent chapters will be published during 1908.

vian filon, kaj li vin trankviligos, kaj li donos ĝojon al via animo. (18) Se ne ekzistas profetaj predikoj, tiam popolo fariĝas sovaĝa, sed bone estas al tiu, kiu observas la leĝojn. (19) Per vortoj sklavon ne instruigas, ĉar li komprenas, sed ne obeas. (20) Se vi vidas homon, kiu tro rapidas kun siaj vortoj, vi de malsaĝulo povas pli esperi, ol de li. (21) Se oni de infaneco kutimigas sklavon al delikateco, li poste fariĝas sentaŭgulo. (22) Kolerema homo kaŭzas malpacojn, kaj flamiĝema kaŭzas multajn pekojn. (23) La fiereco de homo lin malaltigos, sed humilulo atingos honoron. (24) Kiu dividas kun ŝtelisto, tiu malamas sian animon; li aŭdas la ĵuron kaj nenion diras. (25) Timo antaŭ homoj faligas en reton, sed kiu fidus Dion, tiu estas ŝirmita. (26) Multaj serĉas favoron de reganto, sed la sorto de homo dependas de Dio. (27) Maljusta homo estas abomenaĵo por virtuloj, kaj kiu iras la ĝustan vojon, estas abomenaĵo por malvirtulo.

ĈAPITRO XXX.

(1) VORTOJ de Agur, filo de Jake. Profeta parolo de tiu viro al Itiel, al Itiel kaj Ukal. (2) Ĉar mi estas la plej malklera homo, kaj homan prudenton mi ne posedas. (3) Kaj mi ne lernis saĝon, kaj sanktaĵon mi ne komprenas. (4) Kiu leviĝis en la ĉielon kaj malleviĝis? kiu kolektis la venton en siajn mankavojn? kiu ligis la akvon en la veston? kiu aranĝis ĉiujn limojn de la tero? Kia estas lia nomo? kaj kia estas la nomo de lia filo? ĉu vi scias? (5) Ĉiu diro de Dio estas pura; Li estas ŝildo por tiuj, kiuj Lin fidus. (6) Ne aldonu al Liaj vortoj, por ke Li ne punu vin kaj por ke vi ne aperu mensoganto. (7) Du aferojn mi petis de vi; ne rifuzu al mi, antaŭ ol mi mortos: (8) falsaĵon kaj mensogaĵon forigu de mi, malriĉecon kaj riĉecon ne donu al mi, nutru min per tiom da pano, kiom mi bezonas. (9) Ĉar alie mi eble trosatiĝus kaj neus kaj dirus: "kiu estas Dio?" aŭ eble mi malriĉiĝus kaj ŝtelus kaj fariĝus krimulo kontraŭ la nomo de mia Dio. (10) Ne kalumnii sklavon antaŭ lia sinjoro, por ke li ne malbenu vin kaj vi ne fariĝu kulpulo.

ESPERANTO NOTES.

WE trust that none of our American Esperantists are forgetting the approaching Esperanto Congress, to be held in this country next August. Any Esperantist or organization that has suggestions for the Congress should kindly communicate them either to Professor Papot or to this office.

H. Bolingbroke Mudie, the able young Englishman, who virtually organized the third Congress and has done so much for Esperanto, has kindly offered to help us on the other side of the water in the organization of the *Kvina*. His letter, which follows is very stimulating.

“KENSINGTON GARDENS SQ., LONDON W.,

“November 3, 1908.

“MY DEAR FORMAN,—Many thanks for your last. Now you no doubt know the part the U. E. A. played in arranging Caravans to Dresden. There is a great scope for talent next year, and it would be a good plan, I think, if you would send your 36 cents subscription to Geneva (8 rue Bovy Lysberg) and say at the same time that you will be glad if all publicity can be given to your desire that all persons hoping to be present at the *Kvina*—giving of course the actual date decided upon—would communicate that fact to your European representative, whoever that may be.

“There must be somebody on this side—the better known the better—who will canvass for members, and work up an Esperanto ship with Zamenhof Honorary Admiral, etc., etc.

“I enclose some papers on the Caravan to Dresden I ran this year, and friend Luders of Philadelphia will give you verbatim particulars of some of its earlier details.

“Now, if you can find nobody more competent to do this, I will do my best to stir things up, *if you will keep me stuffed with information as it becomes available*. I am already British correspondent for ‘La Revuo,’ and would have no difficulty in getting the Esperanto Press, as of course applies equally to you. But I think it would be best for many reasons to have a representative on this side. . . .

"As regards the official Touring section of the U. E. A. you will notice that Schmid of Bern is chief. In this matter, however, I feel that a Britisher, more accustomed to ships, etc., should have the matter in hand on this side, and as President of U. E. A. I am willing to do my best and give up my time to making the trip a real success. But only if you wish me to.

"Re lines of transport, our Cambridge motto was The Best is Good Enough for us—provided the Price suits. How about the Cunard? or Can. Pac. You suggested White Star. I have an absolutely open mind on the subject, being in blissful ignorance so far, but I do not want you to commit yourselves to any one line until you are absolutely satisfied that they will treat you fair, and do you better than any other. Esperanto menus, concerts, etc., are details to arrange later.

"The ideal would be to have a special ship, full of none but Esperantists, which would sail from London, call at Antwerp or Havre for Continentals, and return at our convenience. But that wants thinking over.

"You must think my notes rather rambling, but no doubt the gist is plain.

"The Esperantists will have to be educated up to taking this plunge into the New World.

"Propose a rundreise inclusive ticket from port of departure, visiting Congress, and Niagara, and anything else sufficiently accessible and attractive, and many will strive to make the great *sacrifices* which, whether you can at present appreciate it or not, are inevitable to the majority.

"With kind regards to our common friends and to yourself,

"I am yours, very sincerely,

"H. BOLINGBROKE MUDIE."